

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XVI, No. 1.

JAN., 1939

MALNUTRITION

THE topic with which this article deals is one with very far-reaching ramifications. It concerns the doctor and the physiologist, the bio-chemist, the statesman, the economist, the statistician, and last but not least, the Christian, aware of his responsibility for his neighbour. The doctor is called in to deal with the end-results of malnutrition. He has to diagnose them for what they are (deficiency diseases), and, so far as lies in his power, to cure, or at least relieve them. It is the business of the physiologist and of the bio-chemist to provide the doctor with the knowledge of the body's vital processes and functions, which is necessary for him to fulfil his duty to his ill-nourished patients. The statesman conscious of his responsibilities to the community cannot ignore the fact that health is an asset of national importance and that it is to a large extent conditioned by nutrition. To the economist, widespread malnutrition suggests a defective employment of the resources of the nation. The statistician can render valuable help by reducing the mass of information relating to malnutrition to a manageable shape. The Christian must realize that spiritual development is not independent of the material conditions in which men have to live, and that the petition "Give us this day our daily bread" must not be thwarted by a defective utilization of the resources of nature or by the maldistribution of the fruits of production.

By the term "malnutrition", in ordinary conversation, is usually meant a physical state resulting from a diet which is insufficient for the needs of the normal human body. Experts in the matter are inclined to confine the meaning of the term to the absence or shortage of one or other of the ingredients necessary

for health from the dietary, and to use the term "undernutrition" to signify a shortage of the total food supply included in the diet.¹ A child might be receiving as much bread, sugar, potatoes and meat as it could eat and yet suffer from the effects of malnutrition. Malnutrition suggests primarily a defect in the *quality* of the diet, in the kind of food consumed ; undernutrition or undernourishment suggests a defect in the quantity of food consumed. The distinction is, for certain purposes, a useful one, though it might not satisfy the exigencies of a formal logician. It will be more easily understood after a consideration of the elements which ought to be included in a diet if it is to satisfy the normal requirements of health.

In the ordinary course of life the body expends energy and uses up tissue. This energy must be replaced and this tissue restored (and, if the body be still growing, increased) by food and drink. Energy is imparted by foods which are classified as fats, carbohydrates (i.e. bread, potatoes, sugars and the like) and proteins (i.e. lean meats, fish, eggs, milk, vegetables). These foods (especially proteins) also repair tissue-wastage and build new tissue. The body also requires certain minerals : calcium and phosphorus for the bones, iron and copper for the blood, iodine for the thyroid gland, and some sulphur, magnesium, sodium and chlorine ; and, as fairly recent research has proved, it cannot do without what are known as "vitamins". Ten of these vitamins have now been differentiated, though about most of them little is yet known. The most important appear to be vitamin A, known as the anti-infective vitamin (found in milk, fats, liver, suet, carrots, green vegetables and fish oil) ; vitamin B, which aids digestion and the nervous system (found in yeast, milk, kidney, liver, raw green vegetables, potatoes, pigmeat) ; vitamin C, the

¹ See *The People's Food*, by Sir William Crawford and H. Broadley, 1938.

sover
veget
oils a
the b
in b
butter
rich
not a
ment
as di
to ex
"
units
mine
yet t
nutr
abse
I
Med
"the
be i
wor
stru
mitt
the
chil
was
allo
esti
as a
on
wor
dou
wor
wor
—
193

sovereign preservative against scurvy (fruit and vegetables), and vitamin D, which is found in fish oils and can be synthesized by the body itself when the body has been exposed to certain rays to be found in bright sunlight. Certain foodstuffs—eggs, milk, butter, cheese, fruit, green vegetables—are particularly rich in these minerals and vitamins, though they are not absent from other articles of diet. The foods just mentioned are called “protective”, and malnutrition as distinguished from undernutrition is the term used to express a deficiency of protective foods.

“A diet may provide all the calories (energy-units) which the body needs ; it may contain certain minerals and vitamins in considerable quantities, and yet those consuming it may be suffering from ‘malnutrition’ because other minerals or vitamins are absent, or are present in inadequate amount.”¹

In 1933 a committee was set up by the British Medical Association with the object of discovering “the minimum expenditure on foodstuffs which must be incurred by families of varying size if health and working capacity are to be maintained, and to construct specimen diets”. In the report of this committee, published in 1933, an estimate was made of the cost of a dietary for a man, his wife, and three children under fourteen years of age, an estimate which was revised at the beginning of this year (1938) to allow for the rise in prices of foodstuffs. This latest estimate is £1 7s. 4½d. as a minimum, £1 16s. 11¼d. as a maximum. (The father is assumed to be engaged on “moderately” heavy work, which is the typical work of the unskilled manual worker, though undoubtedly many of these workers are doing “heavy” work which requires a better diet for “health and working capacity”.²)

In November 1937 the Women’s Advisory Council

¹ Crawford and Broadley, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

² On this see *The Human Needs of Labour*, by B. Seeböhm Rowntree (1937), pp. 61–3.

of the Labour Party reported that the cost at that date of the B.M.A. dietary was £1 7s. 2d. as a minimum, on the assumption that bread was bought, not baked at home, £1 4s. 9½d. if bread was made at home; the maximum was £1 16s. 2d. if the bread was bought, £1 11s. 1½d. if the bread was baked at home. It will be noticed that there is a close correspondence between this estimate and that of the B.M.A.

Mr. S. B. Rowntree (op. cit.) set himself the task of establishing a standard of diet which he calls "minimum" in the sense that no section of the community should be compelled to live below it. He writes (op. cit., p. 160), "I have sought to adopt such conservative figures that no impartial reader could maintain that my standard was extravagant. I know that this lays me open to the criticism that it is too low, and I admit that I should find it easier to defend the case for raising than for lowering it." In point of fact, he *has* been criticized by dietitians on the ground that his dietary is insufficient for his purpose. For instance, he assumes that bread is baked at home, an unreal assumption in most parts of the country today. He excludes fresh or liquid milk from the dietary, substituting canned skimmed milk; and for a family of five he allows only 2 pints a day, whereas the Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Health considers there should be 4½ pints for three children, apart from their parents' requirements. We may compare both these estimates with that of the B.M.A.—14 pints a week of *fresh* milk for a family of five. He allows the father of the family less protein and fewer calories than men in local prisons engaged on "other than light labour" receive, as he himself points out (pp. 70-1). He estimated that at 1936 prices the cost of this diet for a family of five would be £1 os. 6d. In a lecture he delivered last March¹ he revised this estimate, increasing it to £1 1s. 5d. He drew attention to the

¹ Reported in *The Manchester Guardian*, March 16th, 1938.

fact that this allowed for no more than three dependent children in the family, and that one-third of the nation's children belong to families having more than this number, so that they would not be provided for on this estimate of cost.

So far we have been discussing estimates of the minimum diet required for physical efficiency, a diet which "will suffice to prevent definite diseases due to malnutrition". But this is not the same thing as a diet which will, so far as nutrition is concerned, provide for perfect health. Two estimates have been made of an "optimum" diet; one by Sir John Orr,¹ whose standard is a "minimum diet for maximum health", "a state of well-being such that no improvement can be effected by a change in the diet", the latter description corresponding with that of a committee set up by the League of Nations in 1935 and with the standard for health accepted by an Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Health (appointed in 1935). Mr. Rowntree considers that the cost of the dietary accepted by the League committee would have cost (at 1936 prices) about 6s. a week more than that proposed by himself; but, as has already been said, at 1938 prices this amount would only suffice to bring up his dietary to the B.M.A. minimum standard. Sir John Orr does not give an estimate of cost which is strictly comparable with those just mentioned, but he found that only in income-groups spending on the average 10s. per head per week on food was the diet up to his standard.

The next question is what is the number of people in this country who are not attaining (i) the minimum standard of diet, (ii) the optimum standard?

Allowing for the fact that bread is not usually baked at home, it is estimated by Mr. Harold Macmillan,² that about 13½ million people (30 per cent of

¹ *Food, Health and Income*. 2nd edition, 1937.

² *The Middle Way* (1938), p. 61.

our population) either just reach or fall considerably below Mr. Rowntree's standard (at 1936 prices). Sir John Orr cautiously estimated in 1936 that half of our population (20 million people) were not receiving sufficient income to enable them to obtain a diet completely adequate for health (Orr, *op. cit.*, p. 11). Sir William Crawford estimates that in the period of his inquiry (October 1936–March 1937) at least 20 million people, and in regard to certain nutrient constituents, possibly 30 million, were living on diets providing a lower standard of nutrition than that of the B.M.A. minimum diet (*op. cit.*, p. 327); of these, 16 million fell short because their expenditure on food was too low; 4 million (possibly 14 million) because their expenditure on food was misdirected (p. 328). He makes the further estimate that over 23 million individuals (51.7 per cent. of the population) were living in homes where the weekly per head expenditure on food was insufficient to reach the League of Nations standard.

How far this mass-malnutrition is connected with insufficient income (and not merely with ill-directed expenditure) must next be considered. The 1938 report of the Pioneer Health Centre, Peckham, remarks that malnutrition is not merely a matter of supply of food, even when supply is insufficient. It is a matter of effective utilization of supply by the body: a biological problem as yet unsolved. Even the "well-fed" may suffer from malnutrition. Nevertheless, food sufficient in quality and quantity is necessary to build up a healthy individual, and there is strong evidence that the main cause of national malnutrition is poverty. Sir John Orr points out (*op. cit.*, p. 49) that in the lower income groups stunted growth, rickets, caries and anaemia are fairly widespread, and all of these are attributable to dietary deficiencies characteristic of these groups. He quotes the report of the Registrar General for 1927 to prove that the death-

rate fr
nearly
the hi
cit., p
culosis
versity
Science
"The
is the
the pr
"for t
wante
even
V
on A
maln
years
facto
child
cent
who
addi
show
Sir J
divic
4½ m
head
is de
peop
per v
the t
per
min
have
than
amo
food
defi

rate from tuberculosis amongst occupied males was nearly three times as high for unskilled labour as for the higher ranks of business and professional life (op. cit., p. 50). Malnutrition reduces resistance to tuberculosis. The Professor of biochemistry at the University of London (J. C. Drummond), in his preface to *Science and Nutrition*, by A. L. Bacharach (1938), writes: "The only real problem of nutrition in England today is the task of making available to the poorest person the protective foods", and according to Mr. Bacharach, "for the vast majority of the world's workers what is wanted is not mainly an altered order of courses or even a better cook or kitchen, but simply more money".

Viscount Astor, speaking in the House of Lords on August 7th, 1938, said that the committee on malnutrition, of which he was chairman, after two years' deliberation was quite emphatic that the main factor in producing malnutrition was poverty. Of the children who enter school at five (he went on), 16 per cent show some physical defect, whereas of the children who attend open-air schools and receive food in addition to what they get at home only 7 per cent show physical defects. As a result of his investigations Sir John Orr concludes that if the population is divided into six income-groups, the first, comprising $4\frac{1}{2}$ million people with an income of up to 10s. per head per week, lives on a diet which, on Orr's standard, is deficient in every constituent; the second (9 million people), with an income of from 10s. to 15s. per head per week, has a diet which is adequate in protein only; the third (9 million) with an income of from 15s. to 20s. per head per week, has a diet deficient in vitamins and minerals; the higher income groups ($22\frac{1}{2}$ million people), have a diet which is practically sufficient or even more than sufficient. There seems to be general agreement amongst investigators that expenditure on protective food increases as income increases, and that the main deficiencies in national diet are in protective foods.

Some figures given by the Advisory Committee on Nutrition, set up by the Ministry of Health (report 1937), show what this means in the concrete. They consider that each person should consume at least between three and four eggs per week ; most of the poorer classes are unable to afford this. They put forward a minimum for milk consumption ($\frac{7}{8}$ pint per head daily) which is above the average home consumption of all classes, especially of the working class. Their standard for fish consumption is 8 or 9 oz. per head weekly ; the working class eat, on the average, 5 to 6 oz. How many adolescent children get the amount of green vegetables recommended by the Committee (over $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. per day) ? (Crawford, op. cit., pp. 193, 200, 223, 249, 254.) As Crawford remarks : "In the time of Chaucer and Langland the peasant's diet at its best comprised $1\frac{1}{2}$ pints of milk a day, some cheese, and an egg or two, a vast improvement on many working-class diets today" (p. 207).

In the summer of 1938 the University of Bristol carried out a social survey of that town. The town at that time was prosperous and had varied industries : unemployment was at its lowest ; 4,500 families of manual workers and of lower-paid black-coated workers, chosen at random, were investigated, and each family's income for the week of investigation was compared with its needs. These needs were calculated, so far as food was concerned, according to the B.M.A. minimum dietary. Minimum allowances were made for clothes, shelter, fuel, light and cleaning material. It was found that 25 per cent of the families with three dependent children were below the poverty line.¹

The belief that malnutrition is a phenomenon chiefly associated with poverty is confirmed by investigations into weekly earnings and necessary outgoings. After very careful inquiries Mr. Rowntree came to the conclusion that unless a family of five (man, wife and

¹ *The Times*, July 2nd, 1938.

three
incom
year
efficie
1936.
to 55
are 4
towns
ment
home
addre
Macr
neces
of a l
below
by R
rang
of un
or sh
mate
less
their
the
the
The
twel
W
been
Con
larg
skill
und
rur
from
a d
larg
ind

three dependent children) living in a town had an income of 53s. a week, and that for every week of the year, they could not be kept in a state of physical efficiency at the level of prices ruling at the end of 1936. In 1938, prices having risen, he amended this to 55s. (Corresponding figures for country dwellers are 41s. and 43s.) He allows for rent and rates in towns only 9s. 6d., in the country 5s. 6d., and, as was mentioned above, he assumes that bread is baked at home; otherwise, from 1s. to 2s. would have to be added to outgoings. Commenting on this, Mr. Macmillan (op. cit., pp. 43-4) observes: "It is hardly necessary to submit elaborate proof that the incomes of a large proportion of our population fall considerably below the level of minimum human needs as defined by Rowntree. The fact is already well-known. The range is greatly widened if account is taken of periods of unemployment and of loss of time through sickness or short-time working." Mr. Rowntree himself estimates that 40 per cent of urban male workers earn less than 55s. a week. As to agricultural labourers, their average wage as fixed by the Wages Boards for the year ending September 1937 was 33s. 4d. a week; the average wage paid was estimated at 35s. 4d. There has been a slight increase in the succeeding twelve months.¹

Wage statistics for 1933 (since when changes have been small) are given by Mr. and Mrs. Cole in *The Condition of Britain* (1937). They show that in the larger provincial cities the weekly rates for highly skilled work range from well under £3 a week to just under £3 15s. od.; in the smaller towns (excluding rural and non-industrial areas) highly skilled men get from 54s. to 68s. a week. For labourers attached to a definite trade, the rates are from 40s. to 57s. in the larger cities, and from 39s. 6d. to 52s. in the smaller industrial areas. In trades regulated by Trade Boards,

¹ *Economist*, October 29th, 1938.

the predominant rate is from 44*s.* to 54*s.* a week. In agriculture the predominant rates for men (in 1933) were from 28*s.* to 32*s.* 6*d.* As for coal-miners, who are not included in the figures just given, their earnings over the country as a whole averaged from 45*s.* to 47*s.* 6*d.* a week, skilled and less-skilled workers being taken together. The most common rates of wages for skilled workers in the larger towns are from £3 to £3 10*s.* 0*d.* a week ; for the less skilled, from a little over £2 to £2 10*s.* 0*d.* a week.

In summary form, then, it can be said that reliable evidence shows that from 13½ million (Macmillan) to 16 million (Crawford) people in England are spending too little on food to maintain physical efficiency, and that from 20 million (Orr) to 23 million (Crawford) are not spending enough on food for complete health. Combining the most recent pronouncement of the B.M.A. on minimum cost of food with Mr. Rowntree's estimates of the minimum cost of other necessities, we found that the minimum weekly income necessary for the physical efficiency of a family of five in towns is practically 61*s.* a week. There seems no doubt that a very large proportion of the workers of this country, particularly, of course, the unskilled, are receiving considerably less than this amount even when in full work, and this confirms the conclusion reached on medical grounds that the main source of malnutrition is poverty.

The picture thus presented is alarming enough, whether one chooses to regard it from a Christian, a humanitarian, an economic or a national point of view. We hear a great deal about the campaign in favour of physical fitness and about the need for appropriate physical exercises ; but it is obvious that the first requisite of such a campaign is to secure for all enough food and of the right sort. This raises problems which are economic and political ; problems of a better distribution of wealth, of agricultural and industrial

reorg
fiscal
to de
but i
have
adequ
popu
of the
A
vidin
dema
that
reaso
those
and
the
at le
none
the v
of H
milk
year
on g
As f
in E
(but
milk
chil
and
free
Oth
in p
free
are
bot
tion
can

reorganization, of the control of prices of foodstuffs, of fiscal policy and so on. It would be absurd to attempt to deal with such highly controversial questions here, but it should now be clear that ultimately they all have a bearing on the very human problem of securing adequate nourishment for every member of the population in a country which rightly claims to be one of the wealthiest, if not the wealthiest, in the world.

As a step towards that ideal, the scheme for providing children in schools with milk and meals demands our attention. Experiments have shown that a shortage of milk in children's diet is one of the reasons for stunted growth and weight, and that those who take milk at school are less subject to illness and more alert. It has already been mentioned that the Advisory Committee on Nutrition recommends at least $\frac{7}{8}$ pint per head daily, a standard attained by none of the social classes in this country, least of all by the working class. With the sanction of the Ministry of Health, Local Authorities may provide food and milk for expectant mothers, and children under five years of age, at less than cost price if this is necessary on grounds of health and the full cost cannot be paid. As for children attending public elementary schools in England, the Education Authority is empowered (but not obliged) by law to provide meals (including milk) for them, and no charge will be made if the child's education is being hampered for lack of food and the parents are unable to pay the cost.

In Liverpool, I am informed, no child can obtain free meals if anyone in its home is earning money. Other children may buy meals at 3d. per meal, but in practice very few do so. As for milk, it is allowed free to children if the school doctor certifies that they are undernourished. The amount allowed is one bottle containing a third of a pint, though in exceptional cases two bottles are allowed. However, milk can be bought in the schools at $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a bottle, and

practically every child takes advantage of this. My informant also states that in the country districts of the County of Lancashire hardly any meals are needed or provided in the schools. Milk is more easily obtained in the schools there, and children who get it free are allowed a pint a day irrespective of health, subject to a means test which, for a family of five, imposes an income limit of 33s. 9d. after rent has been deducted.

In the lower middle classes, over one third, and in the working class, one quarter, of the children in urban centres are not receiving milk at school; and a still greater proportion in small towns and rural areas (Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 219). According to the Report of the Board of Education for 1936, less than half of the children are receiving milk in schools. That something has been done to improve the diet of school-children is evident from the fact that more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ million are receiving cheap milk, and over 450,000 are getting it free, while 140,000 are being provided with free meals (Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 15). But it is equally evident that many children are not yet benefiting from these plans for improving nutrition. For this, some blame the Education Authorities, either for not adopting the scheme for milk and meals in schools or for administering it in too niggardly a fashion: others blame the parents, saying that they are indifferent to the scheme, to which critics of the Education Authorities reply that parents are often too poor to give their children the coppers for cheap milk, though not poor enough for the children to get milk free: still others say children dislike milk, a statement called in doubt by Dr. Keith Murray (in his survey of milk consumption in Oxford), who found only 7.5 per cent of the children disliked milk. The social reformer will naturally desire to see all Education Authorities provide adequate food, especially milk, for children

under-
them
the in
paren
that
child
woul
ing S
is we
sump
Briti
It
may
nour
nour
upon
part
New
from
nutr
had
that
unsl
econ
the
abo
othe
con
if h
con
wife
her
of t
the
mo
do
the

under their charge if the parents are unable to give them sufficient nourishment ; and, while admitting the need for inquiry into the financial position of the parents before giving food and milk free, will urge that every effort should be made to secure that no child is sacrificed to the poverty of its parents. It would be beyond my scope to discuss the Milk Marketing Scheme and its effect on the price of milk, but it is worth pointing out that an increase in the consumption of liquid milk would be a great benefit to British agriculture.

It must not be overlooked that, just as children may be provided by their parents with adequate nourishment at the expense of the mother's own nourishment, so the amount which can be spent upon food is affected by the cost of other necessities, particularly by rent. Investigations in Stockton and Newcastle have shown that families who have moved from the slums to better houses have fallen to a lower nutrition-level owing to the higher rents which they had to pay. One is constantly hearing complaints that the rents of council houses are too high for the unskilled workers. This again opens up some big economic questions, such as the cost of building and the price of materials, reminding us that, as was said above, the problem of nutrition ramifies into many other problems, and that the social reformer cannot confine his interest to one department of social life if he aims at fundamental improvement in human conditions.

Finally, a word about the working-class housewife. Clearly, if she has to go out of the home to earn her living it is impossible for her to take proper care of the nourishment of her family, and this is one of the convincing arguments against the employment of mothers of families in industry. As regards those who do not have to go out to work, we hear it said that the working-class housewife is ignorant of the nutri-

tion values of various articles of food, and that even if she knew them she is unable to cook meals in an appetising way. Ignorant as she no doubt is, it is an ignorance that she shares with the vast majority of people, and if the result is less disastrous in well-to-do families than amongst the poor, this is because the diet of the former is more plentiful and varied. Her natural desire to cook appetising meals is often thwarted by the cost of fuel and gas : nor must it be forgotten that it is often more expensive to buy food and fuel in small quantities than in large. Poverty has cumulative effects. It may well be admitted that much yet remains to be done in making known the values of various foodstuffs, particularly those which are "protective", as well as in keeping their prices within the reach of all. The problem of teaching girls the principles of practical housewifery, of training them before marriage to run a household on limited means, and of making them interested in housework, especially in face of the attraction of employment in shops and offices, is so complex that I venture no suggestions.

LEWIS WATT, S.J.

T
C
T
gi
tracts
Faith,
"coniv
been
divest
what
religio
childr
the fo
boys
that c
it has
fact,
some
which
this
pater
that
right
mere
exer
they
forfe
not
fath
bene

Ag

1
said
other
that
be m

3
3
V

THE LAW AND THE RELIGION OF CHILDREN IN MIXED MARRIAGES

THE English Courts have decided that they will give no binding effect to the ante-nuptial contracts as to the education of children in the Catholic Faith, which are required by Canon 1061 from the "coniux acatholicus" in mixed marriages. For it has been held that a father cannot voluntarily restrict or divest himself of his right to bring up his children in what religion, or in what branch of the Christian religion,¹ he desires. The general rule is that all children take their religion from their father; and the former custom whereby, in mixed marriages, the boys followed the religion of their father and the girls that of their mother had no legal sanction.² A father, it has been said, must be master of his household. In fact, English law seems to regard his paternal right as somewhat analogous to the right of freedom out of which no one can contract himself, with, however, this important difference, that it is possible for this paternal right to be irretrievably lost. The law expects that the rights it confers (and in our jurisprudence rights are considered to be conferred rather than merely safeguarded by the law³) will be exercised, and exercised worthily and without undue delay. And if they are not so exercised, they will be deemed to be forfeited. Moreover, nowadays this paternal right is not considered so much as inhering in the status of fatherhood as having been bestowed for the children's benefit, to which the judges pay increasing attention.

The leading case on this branch of the law is *re Agar-Ellis* (1878), 10 Chancery Division 49. The

¹ In *re Nevin* [1891] 2 Chancery 299 *Murphy*, Q.C. in argument (at p. 309) said that a distinction had always been drawn between Christianity and other religions. But it seems that when children have adopted a religion that is not Christian and it is against their interests that a change should be made, the courts will not interfere: *re Ullee* (1885) 54 Law Times 286.

² See *Andrews v. Salt* (1873) Law Reports, 8 Chancery 622.

³ See *Holland, Jurisprudence*, 13th Edition, p. 81.

Hon. Leopold Agar-Ellis verbally but unconditionally promised, before his marriage to the Hon. Harriet Stonor, a Catholic, that he would allow the children of this marriage to be brought up in their mother's faith. Some time after the marriage, however, religious difficulties, unfortunately, arose between husband and wife; and in spite of the children's unwillingness, the husband had them removed from all Catholic influence. The wife sought the protection of the law for her children, but the Court of Appeal, relying on a previous decision of a Catholic judge, Lord O'Hagan, refused to interfere with the established right of the father, which had not been abrogated by his ante-nuptial promise.¹

Indeed, so determined are the Courts to leave unfettered this parental right that in *re Borwick*, [1933] 1 Chancery 657, Mr. Justice Bennett held void a clause in a settlement providing that a grandchild should forfeit any interest to which he or she might become entitled under the settlement, if the grandchild should "at any time before attaining a vested interest not be openly or avowedly a Protestant". The reason for this decision was that the clause was an interference with the right of parents to decide the religion of their children; and by parental right in this context must be understood the right of the father, for the dictum of Lord Coke that "husband and wife are one in law, and the husband is that one" is still generally applicable in this branch of the law.

It might at first sight seem that the law on this subject had the support of St. Thomas Aquinas, and the words of the Angelic Doctor were quoted by Lord Justice Slesser in *re Carroll* (1931), 1. K.B., at page 354. He says that it would be wrong for the Church to take Jewish and infidel children from their

¹ Lord Justice James in this case so far forgot to maintain a nice distinction in the use of words as to speak of "the adoration which Catholics paid to the Blessed Virgin".

paren
educ
famil
the fa
right
subm
weigh
child
to de
the f
prosp
exere
foreg
wife

A
not
rebu
have
clear
Cha
Fran
a m
hesi
the
faith
to c
was
if t
inh
fath
wh

infi
ordi
puer
per
eoru
Qua
Arti
tati

parents and bring them up as Christians, since the education of a child is primarily the concern of the family.¹ And as the father is the head and ruler of the family, it follows that he has, naturally, the first right to decide questions as to education. But, it is submitted,² St. Thomas would have given much more weight to an ante-nuptial contract concerning the children's religion than the English law has seen fit to do. It might be argued that by such a contract the future husband transfers his natural right to his prospective wife; or that he agrees to forgo the exercise of this right in much the same way as a priest foregoes his natural right to marry, and that then the wife assumes this right.

Although an ante-nuptial contract of this sort is not legally binding, it may be taken by the Courts as rebuttable evidence of the husband's intention to have his children educated as Catholics. This is clearly shown in the case of *re Clarke* (1882), 21 Chancery Division 317. Before his marriage, in Frankfurt, to Emma Müller, a Catholic, Mr. Clarke, a member of the Church of England, had, after some hesitation, promised in writing that the children of the marriage should be brought up in his future wife's faith. After the husband's death the Court was asked to determine what the religion of the eldest son (who was an infant) should be, and also to decide whether, if that son was brought up as a Catholic, he could inherit a considerable amount of property, since his father at one time seemed to have desired the child who succeeded to his estate to be brought up in the

¹ In his fourth reply to the question "*Utrum pueri Judaeorum et aliorum infidelium sint invitis parentibus baptizandi*," St. Thomas says, "*Homo ordinatur ad Deum per rationem per quam eum cognoscere potest. Unde puer, antequam usum rationis habeat, naturali ordine ordinatur in Deum per rationem parentum quorum curae naturaliter subiacet; et secundum eorum dispositionem sunt circa ipsum divina agenda.*" Sum, Theol. 2-2, Quæst. X, Art. XII.

² This submission is borne by the words at the beginning of the same Article—"Maius enim est vinculum matrimoniale quam ius patriae potestatis in pueros."

Church of England, though this desire was, apparently, later abandoned. The Court of Appeal eventually came to the conclusion that Mr. Clarke did not retract from the intention expressed in his antenuptial promise. His children were, in fact, brought up as Catholics, and it was held that the mere sending of the son to a public school in England was no evidence that the father wished to change the boy's religion. Moreover, the father never attended a Protestant church after his marriage, but frequently went to a Catholic church, and asked a priest to be the godfather of two of his children. Mr. Justice Kay stated the law applicable to this case thus: "Doubtless the Court has to consider, and to make out as far as it can, whether the father has indicated any desire as to the particular faith in which the child should be brought up. . . . Moreover, if the father, without in any direct manner indicating his own desire, has so acted with regard to his child as, in fact, to have chosen the Faith in which he should be brought up, if he has abdicated, or, as it is called in some of the cases, 'abandoned' his right to have the children brought up in his own Faith, that, again, is a thing to which the Court is bound to have regard."¹ The son was allowed to remain a Catholic and to inherit his father's estate.

So a father may, by his intention, whether directly or indirectly expressed during his lifetime, continue to guide the spiritual destinies of his children until they attain their majority. Upon his death his wife becomes guardian of the children under the Guardianship of Infants Act, 1886; but, like other guardians, she is bound by his intention as to their education, and thus she may be compelled to bring them up in their

¹ The learned Judge, who appears to have considered Catholicism something alien, came to his decision after "trying, of course, to divest my mind of the bias which it naturally has in favour of the bringing up of an English boy who is to succeed to an English estate inherited by him from his father's Protestant family in the Protestant faith".

father's Faith, notwithstanding that she is of a different persuasion.¹

The Court will not, however, give effect to a father's intention to have his children brought up as infidels.^{2 3}

Moreover, a father may lose his rights ; and then regard is had to the benefit of the children and the wishes of their mother. Thus, in *Ward v. Laverty*, [1925] A.C. (Ireland) 101, Mathew Ward, who had become a drunkard, failed to support his wife and their children. At length his wife, who had been converted to Catholicism shortly before her marriage, went with the children to live with her parents. She then ceased to practise her religion, and the children were brought up as Presbyterians. Shortly afterwards her husband died, and two years later she followed him to the grave. The husband's aunt sought to obtain custody of the children and have them educated as Catholics. The House of Lords, after having considered what was for the benefit of the children, refused this application ; and the contention that the father's wishes as to the upbringing of his children should prevail was held to be counterbalanced by his immoral habits and unsympathetic behaviour towards them.

Apart from losing his rights through unworthy or neglectful conduct, a father may forfeit them because he did not exercise them at the proper time, or waited too long before asking the Court to see that they were restored to him. His lack of promptitude in enforcing his claims is construed as an acquiescence in the rights acquired by others. "*Vigilantibus, non dormientibus*,

¹ See *re Scanlan* (1888) 40 Chancery Division 200.

² See *Shelley v. Westbrook*, Jac. 266a.

³ It is submitted that this statement of the law is still correct even after the decision of the House of Lords in *Bowman v. Secular Society* [1917] A.C. 406, for, as Dr. Hanbury says in his book on Equity at p. 181 (1st Edition): "Certainly, since the great case of *Bowman v. Secular Society*, it is no longer true to say that Christianity is parcel of the law of England, but that case must not be stretched beyond the limits of what it decides", namely, that a gift to a Society for combating religious doctrine is valid.

aequitas subvenit." This was the principle applied in *re Newton (Infants)* [1896] 1 Chancery 740. Upon his marriage to a lady, who was first a Wesleyan but who later became a member of the Church of Scotland, Mr. Newton obtained from her a promise that their children should be brought up as Catholics. Nevertheless, he allowed his two daughters to be educated as Protestants. After his wife's death he became intemperate in his habits, but subsequently he mended his ways, and then wished his children, who had meanwhile become wards of Court, to be transferred to a Catholic school. The Court of Appeal, however, decided against him mainly on the ground that he had delayed a considerable time before asserting his rights, and that by then his eldest daughter had acquired such a strong Protestant leaning that it might be prejudicial to her general well-being to force her to change her religion. And as to the other daughter, the Court considered that she should not be separated from her sister.

It will be noticed that in this case the Court paid especial regard to the welfare of the children in coming to its decision. In *re Agar-Ellis (supra)*, counsel on behalf of the wife pressed the Court to consider the acquired tendencies and well-being of the children, but the Court of Appeal declined to be paternal, considering that on this point it was no better judge than the father, though it piously urged him to have "a sole regard for the spiritual and temporal welfare of his children". Mr. Justice Kay in *re Clarke (supra)* said that the right of a father to have his children educated as he thought best was given to him for their benefit, and that that was the reason why he could not waive it. And one of the grounds for the Court refusing in that case to order the son's religion to be changed was that, in the absence of an express intention on the part of the father to the contrary, it was not to his benefit that

he sho
or tha
would
Protes

It
Child
tion to
This i
v. Lav
passin
daugh
Court
after
heard
Prote
in rel
held
to ha
and
separ
child
with
their
of th

M
to ch
hear
and
educ

1 s
for cu
make
up in
child
religio
consu

2 s
3 s
Carro
ship
sectio
father
infan

he should be separated from his mother and sisters, or that there should be a divided household, as there would have been if he had been brought up a Protestant.

It seems that after the passing of the Custody of Children Act, 1891,¹ the Courts pay even more attention to the welfare of the children in cases of this kind.² This is shown not only in *re Newton* but also in *Ward v. Lavery (supra)*, both of which were decided after the passing of the Act. In the latter case the eldest daughter, aged 12½ years, was questioned in the Court of first instance as to her religious beliefs, and after the evidence of a Protestant clergyman had been heard it was decided that she had acquired strong Protestant convictions and that consequently a change in religion might be seriously harmful to her. It was held that the younger children were not old enough to have acquired any convictions (their ages were 7 and 5 respectively), but that they should not be separated from their eldest sister, especially as all the children were fond of their maternal grandparents, with whom they were then living, but scarcely knew their paternal relatives, who sought to obtain custody of them.

Moreover, a child, if old enough, may be allowed to choose his own religion.³ Thus in *re W.* (a case heard "in camera"), [1907] 2 Chancery 557, the son and daughter of Jewish parents, who had died, were educated in their father's religion. The boy, how-

¹ Section 4 of the Act provides that "when a parent applies to the Court for custody of a child and custody is refused, the Court may nevertheless make such order as it thinks fit to secure that the child is brought up in the religion in which the parent has a legal right to require that the child should be brought up (that is, if the child is being educated in another religion). But this provision does not affect the power of the Court to consult the child or diminish the child's right to choose".

² See Halsbury's Laws of England (2nd Ed.) Vol. VII. p. 158.

³ See Section 4 of Custody of Children Act 1891, quoted above, and *re Carroll* (1931), 1 K.B. 317, where the effect of section 1 of the Guardianship of Children Act, 1925, was considered. The effect of this latter section is in the words of Lord Justice Slesser in *re Carroll* that "as between father and mother, the court may decide on the basis of the welfare of the infant which religious education it shall be given".

ever, when he was 13, intimated that he wished to become a Christian, and Mr. Justice Kekewich, after questioning him, decided that it would be to his moral disadvantage if his wishes were not granted. This decision was upheld by the judges of the Court of Appeal, who, however, considered that the daughter should remain in the Jewish Faith, as it was not prejudicial for her to do so, since in any event her education would be separate from that of her brother's, owing to the fact that they were orphans.

It will be observed that in this case the father had died before the son expressed his desire to become a Christian. But it is possible that even where an appeal to the children's well-being fails, as it did in *re Agar-Ellis* (which might well be decided differently today on the facts, though the general principle still remains), resort may successfully be had to *Re W.* to prevent a father, who is still alive, from forcing an unwilling child to practise a particular religion.

R. A. G. O'BRIEN.

THE

W
tive
and
serm
exam
origi
refus
the
Resu
and
with
the
Virg
stoo
by C
are
they

a st

par

THE TEACHING OF ST. AUGUSTINE ON OUR BLESSED LADY

- I. *The Espousals of Mary and Joseph*
- II. *The Virgin-birth of Christ*
- III. *The Virginal Conception*
- IV. *The Sinlessness of Mary*
- V. *Did Christ repudiate His Mother?*
- VI. *Mary is "Mother of us all"*
- VII. *Mary is Worthy of our Imitation*
- VIII. *The Blessed Virgin in Writings
Falsely Attributed to St. Augustine*

WE use the word "teaching" expressly because, though St. Augustine was, of course, a speculative theologian, he was also the shepherd of his flock, and he taught them assiduously in innumerable sermons. When he is not certain he says so, for example, when he touches on the problem of the origin of the soul, a question on which he steadfastly refused to dogmatize, also on the harmonization of the narratives of Christ's appearances after His Resurrection. But when he speaks on the Incarnation and the problems involved in that doctrine, he speaks with no uncertain voice. One of these problems was the precise position to be accorded to the Blessed Virgin. On this question he has often been misunderstood, and his famous *dictum* about the words addressed by Christ to His Mother at the wedding feast of Cana are sometimes quoted in an apologetic way, as though they were suspect.

I. The Espousals of Mary and Joseph

In the eyes of Augustine this was a perfect marriage, a statement endorsed by Benedict XIV :

Every good feature of matrimony finds place in Christ's parents : offspring, fidelity, Sacrament : the offspring was

the Lord Jesus Himself ; fidelity—for there was no adultery, the Sacrament, because there was no divorce.¹

And once more :

Christ was born of a mother who, though she conceived without contact with a husband and always remained without such contact, virginal in conceiving, in bringing forth, virginal to her death, was yet espoused to a carpenter.²

Mary's vow of virginity.—But St. Luke clearly shows that previous to her espousals Mary had dedicated her virginity to God by vow :

She would certainly never have said :

"How shall this be done since I know not man" unless she had already vowed her virginity to God. But since such a thing was opposed to Israelite custom she was espoused to an upright man who would not rob her of this but would rather safeguard from violent men what she had already vowed. . . . She could, indeed, have been simply told to remain a virgin, and in her God's Son would, by some fitting miracle, have taken "the form of a servant". But, destined to become an example to all holy virgins, she—lest she should come to be regarded merely as a virgin who, though not "knowing man", merited to conceive a Son—dedicated her virginity to God while as yet all unknowing what it was she was to conceive, so that by a vow, not through any command, through a love that induced a choice, not through any necessity that compelled obedience, she might in her earthly body begin to foreshadow the heavenly life.

In this way Christ, through being born of a virgin who, before knowing who was to be born of her, had decided to remain ever a virgin, chose rather to set the seal of His approval on virginity than to insist upon it ; He wished virginity to be a spontaneous deliberate act.³

¹ *De Nuptiis et Concupiscentiis*, i, 13.

² *De Catechizandis Rudibus*, 40.

³ *De Sancta Virginitate*, 4, cf. *Sermons*, ccxc, 4-6, ccxci, 5.

II. *The Virgin-birth of Christ*

Though in dealing with this before discussing Our Lady's virginal conception we may be thought to be proceeding—as St. Jerome would say—"ordine prae-postero", yet it will serve to clear the ground if we take this subject first. Towards the close of his life St. Augustine drew up a brief list of the various heresies which had been current at one time or another. Among them he includes that of the Valentinians, who held that "Christ was 'sent' by the Father in the sense that He brought with Him from the depths [*profundo*] a spiritual or heavenly body, and that He took nothing from the Virgin Mary but passed through her as through a canal, or a channel, not receiving from her His flesh".¹

But the notion that the virgin-birth must be repudiated because unique in the experience of the world seems to have obsessed some Catholics at that time :

If what I have written [says Augustine in a letter to his friend and future martyr Marcellinus] fails to convince people that the virginity of Mary was possible, then it seems to me that we must perforce repudiate all marvellous happenings in corporeal things. And if your friend who urges this difficulty refuses to believe it on the ground that it is without example, then ask him if he can deny that even in profane literature instances are to be found of things which have only happened once but which are yet accepted as historically sound and not mere empty fables. Ask him that. And if he denies it, then he is much in need of instruction ; if he concedes it, the question is settled.²

Again, when insisting on the marvels of the Incarnation and the virgin-birth, he concludes :

¹ *Haer.*, xi.

² *Ep.* cxliii, 42 ; the friend in question may have been Volusianus, cf. the following extract from *Ep.* cxxxvii, to Volusianus.

If, then, a reason for it is demanded ; if we have to search for parallels, it will not prove to be an isolated instance. For in things like these the sole norm by which we can judge is the power of Him who does them.¹

And so early as A.D. 393 we find him saying :

Do you hesitate, even wholly refuse, to believe in the virgin-birth ? Why, you ought rather to believe that it was but fitting that God-made-man should be so born.

He then quotes *Isaias vii, 14*, and continues :

You will not feel doubtful about a virgin bringing forth provided you want to believe in God being born and, while not surrendering the governance of the world, coming to men in the flesh, conferring fruitfulness on His Mother while preserving her integrity. He was, then, thus fittingly born as a man while always remaining God.²

At a much later period, A.D. 421, he enters into details when setting forth the doctrine on the Incarnation :

It would be wrong to suggest that in taking our nature anything was lacking that pertains to human nature ; yet that same nature which He took was wholly free from all taint of sin ; for it was not with it as with human nature born of the two sexes through the concupiscence of the flesh and in consequence fettered by the sin [of Adam] the guilt of which was washed out by regeneration. But the nature He took was such as was fittingly born of a virgin, not conceived through lust but through that mother's fidelity. Had her virginal integrity been corrupted, even only by His birth, He would not then have been born of a virgin, and the whole Church would—what God forbid—have falsely pronounced that He was “born of the Virgin Mary. That same Church, through imitation of Christ's Mother, daily brings forth those who are members of His Body—and is a Virgin”.³

¹ *Ep. cxxxvii, 8.*

² *De Fide rerum quae non videntur, 5.*

³ *Enchiridion, 34.*

And once more :

He who made man became a man ; of His Mother whom He had created was He Himself created ; he was carried in hands which Himself had fashioned ; fed at breasts which Himself had filled ; in the manger the Word wailed with an infant's dumb wailing, that Word without whom all human eloquence is silent. . . . Let us, then, celebrate with joy the day on which Mary brought forth her Saviour, the day on which Mary, in wedlock, brought forth the creator of wedlock ; Mary given into the hands of a husband, yet a mother who knew no man, a virgin before her marriage and in her marriage, a virgin who became pregnant, a virgin providing milk.¹

III. The Virginal Conception

The key to Mary's conception of her Divine Son was her faith. This might seem an elementary proposition. But Augustine states it in startling fashion :

Mary herself conceived by believing Him whom, by believing, she bore. Let the Holy One, then, who shall be born of a human mother but of no human father, be called the "Son of God". For He who was born of God the Father without any mother had need of a miracle if He were to be "Son of Man". He was born, then, in the flesh, to come forth as a little child through the closed doors of the womb, to rise again in that same flesh and enter like a mighty man through the closed doors [of the tomb]. Marvellous are these things ; for they are divine ; they cannot be expressed in words, for they pass our comprehension ; no man's lips can express them, for no man's heart can fathom them. Mary believed, and what she believed came to pass in her.²

Once more :

When she asked : "How shall this be done?", she was not

¹ *Sermon clxxxviii, 2 & 4*

² *Sermon ccxv, 4.*

doubting the promise. Oh ! how truly "full of grace" ! as the Angel had called her in his salutation. Who can analyse that grace ? Who can be sufficiently thankful for it ? And the Saint concludes by commenting on the *Magnificat* as an example of thanksgiving. In her undoubting faith lay the difference between Mary and Zachary ; to the latter the same Angel had to say : "Because thou hast not believed thou shalt be dumb."¹

And again, apropos of Christ's reply to the woman who had cried out : "Blessed is the womb that bore Thee, and the paps that gave Thee suck", to whom He said : "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it", St. Augustine does not hesitate to say : "More blessed, then, was Mary in receiving the faith of Christ than in conceiving the flesh of Christ."²

It is hard to believe that anyone with a sense of fitness could imagine that a vow of virginity thus ratified by God, a virginity which played so essential a part in the whole economy of the Incarnation, should have subsequently been disregarded. Yet the Helvidians—as well as some modern writers—denied Mary's virginity since they held that after bearing Christ she bore other sons to her husband Joseph. St. Augustine thinks that these heretics are probably to be identified with those whom St. Epiphanius calls "Antidicomaritae".³

Pelagius, on the contrary, was compelled by his principles to uphold not only Mary's virginity but her absolute sinlessness. For he maintained that the great saints of the Old Testament were "not only without sin but lived most holy lives", and he ended his list of such Saints with the name of "the Mother of our Lord and Saviour, for true piety compels us to say that she was sinless". Augustine replied :

¹ *Sermon* ccxc, 4-5, cf. ccxci, 5.

² *Haer.*, lxxxiv.

³ *De Sancta Virginitate*, 3.

With the exception, then, of the Holy Virgin Mary—in whose case I decline to allow any question of sin by reason of the honour due to the Lord—for how do we know what extremes of grace for overcoming sin of every kind was conferred upon one who merited to conceive and to bring forth Him who had, as we know, no sin—with that sole exception, then, were it possible to assemble all those sainted men and women and ask them whether they were sinless when upon earth, what answer would they make? Would their answer be that of Pelagius or that of John the Apostle who said: “If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.”¹

Mary’s perpetual virginity is always insisted on by St. Augustine. To quote but a few phrases taken at random:

Virgo concepit, virgo peperit, virgo permansit (*Sermon* li, 18); virgo ante conceptum, virgo post partum (*Sermon* cxc, 2 and 4); virgo concepit, miramini; virgo peperit, plus miramini; post partum, virgo permansit. Generationem ergo quis enarrabit! (*Sermon* cxv, 1, cf. *Contra Julianum* i, 4, *De Genesi ad Litt.*, x, 32).

Hence Augustine repudiates any interpretation of the expression “the brethren of the Lord”, which involves the rejection of Mary’s perpetual virginity. These “Brethren” must have been “consobrini” or “compatrueles”, or in some sense “consanguinei”,² while those who hold that she afterwards had children by St. Joseph are known as “Antidicomaritae”.³

IV. The Sinlessness of Mary

The Manichees and the Pelagians alike, though on different grounds, had besmirched Our Lady’s fame. Faustus, for instance, seems to have implied that she

¹ *De Natura et Gratia*, 42.

² *Tract.* x, 2, xxviii, 3–4 in *Joann.*

³ *Haer.*, lvi, see above.

must, like other descendants of Adam, have experienced the rebellion of the flesh. But, arguing that all such rebellion ceases, when governed by reason, to be shameful, St. Augustine, after referring to the Patriarchs, continues :

How much more then in the case of the Holy Virgin must such shameful rebellion have been absent when we consider that her bodily functions had never been exercised even for the purpose of lawful human conception, but only for her divine pregnancy. In no way whatever, then, did Christ, by being born of her, render her less worthy ; He Who had bestowed fruitfulness on her would never have deprived her of the glory of her virginity.¹

Julian the Pelagian, too, driven by his repudiation of the doctrine of Original Sin into a number of heretical positions, held, among other things, that the Incarnation did not involve the notion that an individual human nature was assumed by the Second Person of the Trinity and was then to be born of a virgin, but rather that a certain individual man, born of a virgin, made such spiritual progress that he deserved to be united to the Godhead. The conclusion, of course, being that we can all, if we like, do the same.² He held, too, that since Christ was of the seed of Abraham, His flesh must—if it really came from a mother born of carnal generation—have been that “sinful flesh” (“caro peccati”) of which St. Paul speaks (Rom. viii, 3).³ He also maintained that St. Paul’s statement that “by one man sin entered into this world” (Rom. v, 12), only meant that all who sinned were but imitating Adam in his sin. More emphatically still : that carnal descent from Adam must have involved the inheritance by Christ of sinful flesh, whereas we know that He was sinless.⁴

¹ *Contra Faustum*, xxix, 4.

² *Contra Julianum, Opus Imperf.*, iv, 84.

³ *Contra Julianum*, v, 52.

⁴ *Opus Imperf.*, iv, 79.

These and similar propositions involved false ideas as to the part played by the Blessed Virgin in the Incarnation. In the first place, as Augustine is never tired of pointing out, there is a vast difference between that "sinful flesh" to which we are heirs and that "*likeness* of sinful flesh" which St. Paul expressly attributes to Christ (Rom. viii, 3). Further: "Although Christ was, according to the flesh, of the seed of Abraham, since the Virgin Mary of whom He took flesh was begotten of that same seed, yet He did not incur the guilt of that seed because, since not conceived of human seed, He was free from that seed's connexion with concupiscence."¹ The Bishop feels it incumbent on him to explain this more fully:

The concupiscence of the flesh either did not exist in Adam at all previous to his sin or it was vitiated in him through his sin. And if it did exist in his case, it could, at any rate, have been subservient to his will. Of course, if things were like that now, the flesh would never "lust against the spirit". We must conclude, then, either that concupiscence itself is a vice—if, that is, there was no such thing before sin came into this world, or that it is a power which has been vitiated by sin, with the further conclusion that original sin is transmitted through it. In Mary's body, then, there was that fleshly material whence Christ derived His Own flesh, but it was not carnal concupiscence that sowed Christ in her. He, then, was born of the flesh and with flesh, yet "in the *likeness* of sinful flesh", not as other men, "in sinful flesh". Hence was He able by regeneration to destroy Original Sin in others, for He Himself had not contracted it by generation. Hence the expression the "first and the second Adam". Just as the former was fashioned without carnal concupiscence, so was the latter born without it; the former, however, was only a man, the latter both God and man; the former was able not to commit sin, unlike the latter who was not able to sin.²

¹ *Opus Imperf.*, iv, 104.
Vol. xvi.

² *Opus Imperf.*, vi, 22.

St. Augustine reiterates this in a letter to his friend Evodius, Bishop of Fussala :

Christ took from the Blessed Virgin the true substance of His flesh, but not "the flesh of sin" because the flesh He took was not derived from carnal concupiscence, whether we regard that flesh as sown or as conceived. It was, indeed, mortal flesh and would change as His age developed, in the same way as "the flesh of sin", but "without sin".¹

V. Did Christ Repudiate His Mother ?

We referred at the outset to St. Augustine's interpretation of "My hour has not yet come", an interpretation which to many has seemed far-fetched :

The fact that when on the Cross Christ acknowledged Mary as His Mother and entrusted her to the "beloved disciple" was a fitting demonstration of His human affection for her when, as Man, He was dying. But that hour had not yet come when, on the point of turning the water into wine, He said to that same Mother : "What is to Me and to Thee, woman, My hour has not yet come" (John ii, 4). For not from Mary had He received the Divine Powers He had ; from her He had received that which hung upon the Cross.²

Now this oft-quoted statement does not stand alone ; it is but one expression of something which, to Augustine's mind, was evident. Thus apropos of Our Lord's question : "Who is My mother ?" (Matt. xii, 46) he asks :

How could Christ the Lord, with any filial piety, condemn His Mother, and that not any ordinary mother but His Virgin-mother, that Mother to whom He had given fruitfulness in such fashion as not to deprive her of her virginal integrity, a Virgin-mother who conceived, a Virgin

¹ Ep. clxiv, 19.

² Sermon ccxviii, 10.

in her bringing forth, a Virgin ever remaining such? He did contemn that Mother lest she should obtrude herself into the work He was doing and her maternal affection should prove a hindrance to Him.¹

Even more explicitly :

We must repudiate the opinion of people who say that Christ had no earthly mother, for the Incarnation did honour to both the male and the female sex. It was also intended to show that God's care extended not only to him whom He thus assumed, but to her through whom He assumed Him ; for He took a human nature and was born of a woman. Nor do the words : "What is to Me and to Thee, woman? My hour has not yet come" compel us to say that Christ repudiated His Mother. Rather are they meant to warn us that as God He had no mother at a moment when He wished to show forth His majestic Personality by changing water into wine. But when He was crucified it was as a man ; then had come the "hour" which had not yet arrived when He said : "What is to Me and to Thee", the hour, that is, when I shall recognize Thee. For then, crucified as a man, He acknowledged His Mother as a fellow human being, and was most careful to entrust her to His "Beloved Disciple".²

The Manichees declared, in accordance with their fundamental principle, that all material things were evil, that Christ could not possibly have had a mother. It was easy, of course, for Augustine to refute them out of that very passage of the Gospel which—so they insisted—told of His repudiation of any mother when He said : "Who is My mother . . . ?" (Matt. xii, 48). But Augustine improved the occasion : "Did not the Virgin Mary do the will of the Father, she who believed by faith, conceived by faith, and was chosen, she of whom our Salvation was to be born amongst us men, she who was created by

¹ *Sermon xxv*, 2 in the *Collectio Denisiana*, P.L. xlvii, 819.

² *De Fide et Symbolo*, 9.

Christ before Christ was created in her? Holy Mary did emphatically the will of the Father; it was, then, a greater thing for her to have been Christ's disciple than to have been His Mother. She was more "blessed" for having been His disciple than for having been His Mother. Indeed, more blessed is she in that before she brought Him forth she bore her Teacher in her womb. . . . She heard the word of God and kept it. In truth she even kept the truth in her mind more than she kept His flesh in her womb. . . . For greater is that which is borne in the mind than that which is carried in the womb.

Holy Mary, then, blessed Mary, then. But the Church is a better thing than Mary. For Mary is a part of the Church, a holy member of it, its outstanding member, indeed, its supereminent member—but still a member of the whole body of the Church. And assuredly the whole body is greater than one of its members.¹

Once more, on the same passage (Matt. xii, 42):

Mary too, then, since she did the will of the Father, was "blessed". For this did the Lord praise her; not because flesh begot flesh but because she did the will of the Father, as though He would say: "My Mother whom you have declared 'blessed' is, indeed, blessed because she kept the word of God, not because in her 'the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us', but because she kept, too, that very Word of God by whom she was made and who, in her, 'was made flesh'."²

VI. Mary is "Mother of Us All"

This one woman, then, is both Virgin and Mother not only in spirit but in body. She is Mother in spirit—not,

¹ Sermon xxv, 2-3, 7 in the *Collectio Denisiana* published by Denis in 1792 and printed in *P.L.* xlv, cols. 818-940. Dom Morin republished all save Nos. i & x in the *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, i, 1930; those two numbers he considers spurious.

² Tract. x, 3 in Joann.

indeed, of our Head, that is our Saviour, of whom we should rather say that she herself was spiritually born since all who believe in Him—and she, of course, is to be reckoned among these—are fittingly called “sons of the Bridegroom” (Matt. ix, 15). But of a surety she is the Mother of Christ’s members—which we are, for she collaborated with Him through charity so that faithful members might be born in the Church, and these are members of that Head. Bodily, however, she is the Mother of the Head Himself. For it was but fitting that our Head should, by a wondrous miracle, be born according to the flesh, of a virgin, in order to signify thereby that His members are to be born according to the spirit in the virgin Church.

Mary alone, then, was both in spirit and in body virgin and mother ; Christ’s Mother and Christ’s Virgin ; the Church is—in the case of those Saints who are to possess the kingdom of God—wholly Christ’s Mother spiritually, wholly Christ’s virgin ; but not wholly so according to the body, for in the case of some she is Christ’s virgin, to some she is a mother—but not Christ’s Mother.¹

VII. *Mary is Worthy of Our Imitation*

I would more especially urge youths and maidens who are dedicating their integrity to God to try and realize with what immense humility they must watch over this so long as they are living here on earth ; all the more that the vows they are taking are a matter of heaven. Is it not written, indeed : “The greater thou art, the more should you humble yourself in all things” (Ecclus. 111, 20). While, then, it is my duty to speak to such people of the greatness of what they are doing, it is their business to reflect upon it with great humility.

With the exception, then, of certain saintly fathers and mothers who were married and who are in no sense surpassed by these young unmarried people—were they married they would not be their equals !—let these same young people

¹ *De Sancta Virginitate*, 6.

have no manner of doubt but that they surpass all other married people of the present day, even married people who, after having lived in matrimony, now live in continence; and they surpass them not simply as Susanna surpassed Anna but even as Mary surpassed both Susanna and Anna. I am speaking, of course, of holy integrity of the body, for none can be ignorant of Mary's other merits.¹

Nor, indeed, should we pass over the wonderful modesty of the Virgin Mary. For though she had merited to bring forth the Son of the Most High, she was yet most humble, never setting herself above her husband, even putting his name first; for she did not say: "I and Thy father have sought Thee", but "Thy father and I". She recked not of the dignity of her womb but only of respect to her husband. . . . She, then, in whose footsteps you tread, in conceiving dwelt not with a man, and when she brought forth yet remained a virgin. Imitate her so far as you can. . . . For much more will He who did not rob His Mother of her virginity when she, in her body, brought Him forth, preserve in you by His spiritual embrace that same virginity.³

VIII. *The Blessed Virgin in Writings Falsely Attributed to St. Augustine*

Nearly all the above extracts are taken from St. Augustine's sermons to his people. For it must be remembered that his *Enarrationes in Psalmos* as well as his *Tractatus in Joannem* were written as sermons, even though they may not all of them have actually been delivered. The other writings from which we have quoted are all of them doctrinal expositions meant to teach not only the recipients of them, or the persons to whom they were addressed, but a wide circle of readers. For the Saint was well aware that every word he wrote was eagerly studied, not only

¹ *De Bono Viduitatis*, 35.

² *Sermon* li, 18.

³ *Sermon* cxcii.

by his friends but by his enemies. He realized, too, that he wrote for posterity: "My letter," he says at the close of a very lengthy epistle to Vincent the Rogatist, "is perhaps longer than you care for. It would have been much more brief had I believed that I was writing for yourself only. For though what I have said may not produce much effect on yourself, I do not think it can fail to advantage people who trouble to read it with the fear of God and without respect of persons."¹ Again, we find him writing in A.D. 413 or 414 that "old age—the common infirmity of the human race!" is coming on apace, and that he hopes now to devote himself wholly to ecclesiastical studies "in which I fancy that with God's help I can be helpful to posterity".²

This fact gives added weight to the above-quoted passages relative to Our Lady. They express the mind of Augustine, teacher, and Doctor of the Church, and they are marked by a soberness of judgement and a self-restraint which is all the more remarkable when we realize how warm were his affections and how readily he expressed them.

At one time or another some 1748 sermons have been attributed to St. Augustine, and published under his name. Of this immense number 875 may be certainly regarded as the authentic product of the Bishop of Hippo, thus leaving 873 of which very few indeed have any real claim to be by him. It will be of interest, then, to compare what is said of Our Lady in the sermons justly attributed to him with the attitude towards her discoverable in the spurious sermons. As the reader cannot have failed to remark, St. Augustine is, when speaking of the position of Our Blessed Lady in the mystery of the Incarnation, simply concerned with the theological aspects of the question. Very rarely does he indulge

¹ *Ep.* xciii, 53.

² *Ep.* cli, 13, *cf.* *Ep.* cxlvii, 5.

in anything approaching rhapsody.¹ The contrast when we examine some of the sermons which have, at various times, passed under his name, is remarkable. Not that these sermons are extravagant or erroneous in their teaching about her, though on other points they are often marked by semi-Pelagian tendencies, but they indulge in expressions and comparisons which are, on the whole, markedly absent in Augustine. For example, nowhere, so far as we have seen, does he apply to the Blessed Virgin the term "porta clausa",² (*cf.* Ezech. xlv, 2), nor does he quote Jer. xxxi, 22,³ as referring to her, though there is no reason why he should not have done so. It is only in the spurious sermons that we find Our Lady spoken of as "scala coeli",⁴ "fenestra coeli",⁵ the "Promised Land",⁶ the rod of Aaron,⁷ and as "laude dignissima".⁸

We do not, of course, deprecate the use of such expressions; our point is simply that St. Augustine does not use them, though—to repeat—he could quite fittingly have done so. But I do not think St. Augustine could possibly have framed the prayer to our Blessed Lady with which the Breviary has made us all familiar: "Sancta Maria, succurre miseris, juva pusillanimes, refove flebiles, ora pro populo, interveni pro clero, intercede pro devoto femineo sexu. Sentiant omnes tuum juvamen, quicunque celebrant tuam commemorationem. Assiste parata vota poscentium, et repende omnibus optatum effectum. Sit tibi studium assidue orare pro populo Dei, quae meruisti benedicta pretium ferre mundi, qui vivit et

¹ *Denis* xxv, 7, *P.L.* xlvi, 938.

² *Sermon* cxcv, 1, *P.L.* xxxix, 2107; *Sermon* ccxxxiv, 1, *ibid.* 2177.

³ *Sermons* cxix, 3-4, cxiv, *ibid.* 1983 & 2105.

⁴ *Sermon* ccviii, *De Assumptione B. Mariae*, *ibid.* 2129-2137, attributed to St. Fulbert of Chartres of the tenth century, *cf.* *Sermon* ccxiii, 1-2, *ibid.* 1990, attributed with probability to St. Fulgentius of Ruspe, c. A.D. 530.

⁵ *Sermon* ccxiii, 2.

⁶ *Sermon* xxviii, 2, perhaps by St. Caesarius of Arles, *ibid.* 1799.

⁷ *Sermon* ccviii.

⁸ *Sermon* cxci, 5.

regnat in saecula saeculorum";¹ nor do I think he would have directed his monks to offer up a prayer in honour of Mary before beginning the office of the day;² still less would he have counselled them to have a Crucifix with images of Our Lady and St. John.³ In the edition of St. Augustine's works published by Canon Caillau in 1842 there occurs among the *Sermones Inediti*, *Sermon xlii*, *De Passione Domini* vi, which gives a graphic description of the scene during the trial of Christ: "Sanctae mulieres . . . ad Mariam matrem Salvatoris pervenerunt, inveneruntque eam juxta portam Templi, expectantem si jam filium videre posset. Stabat ergo Maria multitudini Judaeorum sociata: aliqui deridentes, aliqui ipsi compatientes. Stabat ergo Maria, brachiis elevatis, crinibus dissolutis, pectore dilaniata, facie jam dolore denigrata, faucibus jam irraucata, vestibibus dilacerata. . . ." The Mother of God is then depicted as entreating the wife of Pilate to intercede "quod filius non occidatur".⁴ The utterly untheological character of this is evident; St. Augustine would have been horror-struck had he heard such words; what would he have felt had he known that they would be attributed to himself!

The influence of St. Augustine on the liturgy for Feasts of the Blessed Virgin appears over and over again: the words of the hymn:

Quem terra, pontus, aethera
Colunt, adorant, praedicant

seem but an echo of "Quem coeli non capiunt unius feminae sinus ferebat (*Sermon clxxxiv*, 3), while the words of another hymn "coeli femestra facta es" appear in a sermon long attributed to St. Augustine, though

¹ *Sermon cxciv*, 5, *P.L.* xxxix, col. 2107.

² *De Vita Eremitica*, 14, almost certainly the work of St. Aelred of Rivaux in the twelfth century, *P.L.* xxxii, 1456.

³ *Ibid.* 39, col. 1463.

⁴ *Vol. xxiv, bis*, pp. 219-226.

perhaps due to St. Fulgentius of Ruspe (*Sermones* cxxiii, 2, *inter spuria*, P.L. xxxix, 1991). The words of the versicle "Elegit eam Deus, et prae-elegit eam" reflect Augustine's constant use of the word "elegit" when dwelling on Mary's prerogatives.

The practice of attributing the authorship of certain prayers to Saints and others who made them familiar by their frequent use of them has often been the source of confusion ; an instance is to hand in the way in which the *Anima Christi* is sometimes called "The Prayer of St. Ignatius". Prayers seem not infrequently to have been drawn up which were, in fact, little more than "catenae"—not so much of actual phrases taken from great authors—but of sentiments couched more or less in their familiar language. For example, in the Dominican Missal the first of the Prayers suggested to the priest as suitable before he says Mass is entitled *De Dignitate Sacerdotis, ex S. Augustino*. But the most diligent search among all the writings correctly or incorrectly attributed to the Saint has failed to discover anything approaching this Prayer. The same has to be said of the *Oratio Sancti Augustini*, published by order of Pope Urban VIII, and printed in the Roman Missal among the prayers that can be said after Mass.

The same must be said, too, of the Admonition : *Quam graviter peccat sacerdos suscipiens Corpus Christi in peccato : ex SS. Ambrosio et Augustino*. For while the sentiments are certainly what we should expect from St. Augustine, no trace of them can be discovered in his writings, whether authentic or spurious. This *Admonitio* is given in the Dominican Missal among the *Preces ante Missam*.

Finally, in the Roman Breviary, and in that used by the Dominican Order, as well as in some others, the first two lessons of the second nocturn for the Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin (8 Sept.), are said to be taken from a sermon by

St. Augustine (18 *de Sanctis, qui est 2 de Annuntiatione*). The Maurist editors, however, regarded this sermon as spurious (see *P.L.* xxxix, 2104-2107), though the editors of the Louvain edition felt doubtful. Some attribute it to St. Fulgentius of Ruspe, while two MSS. assign it to St. Jerome. Nothing in the sermon definitely refers it to the Feast of the Nativity of Our Lady, a Feast which finds no place in the Carthaginian Calendar; indeed, St. Augustine himself more than once remarks that the Church only celebrates two birthdays, those of Christ and of the Baptist.¹ As a matter of fact, the Breviary lessons only give excerpts from what is a fairly long sermon, and those excerpts are peculiarly "Augustinian" in tone. The Maurists justly point out that the real framer of the sermon—whoever he may have been—drew largely on other sermons attributed to St. Augustine, e.g. *Sermons* 119-121 which, though now rightly labelled "spurious", are modelled on that Saint's sermons and contain whole sentences which have been bodily "lifted" from his authentic work. Use was also made of *Sermon* ccviii, *De Assumptione B. Virginis*, which is certainly not from St. Augustine.²

HUGH POPE, O.P.

¹ E.g. *Sermons* cclxxxvii, 1, ccxcii, 1 & ccxciii, 1.

² Given in *P.L.* xxxix, cols. 2129-2131.

HOMILETICS

Septuagesima

I chastize my body and bring it into subjection (II Cor. ix, 27).

IT is impossible to drift effortlessly into heaven ; salvation is a struggle involving determination and stern endeavour. That should be obvious. Unfortunately it has escaped the attention of many professing christians. It is not without purpose, therefore, that St. Paul in today's Epistle teaches the Corinthians this salutary lesson and rams it home by forcible illustrations taken from the events of the Isthmic Games.

Clearly, he tells them, it is not enough merely to enter the Church to gain salvation any more than it is enough for a runner to win his laurels by just going into the stadium. There must at least be the will to win ; more, there must be the effort to win. How stern, how strenuous, must be that endeavour finds fitting illustration in the palaestra. The caestus-fighters—the Corinthians knew it well ; they had seen it many times—spared no pains to get themselves thoroughly fit ; they denied themselves everything that could impair their stamina or agility. Can the christian do less when he is striving, not for perishable laurel-wreaths, but for a crown of imperishable glory ?

To clinch his point, perhaps to encourage his auditory, the Apostle does not hesitate to adduce his own person as exemplar. He has the will to win, he says, and he puts forth his best endeavour. Then, still using the metaphor of the caestus-boxing, though visualizing rather the actual fight than its preparation, he says that he "batters" his body and makes it acknowledge his mastery (literally "knocks it out"), lest, having entered the arena as the herald and urged others to the fight, he himself become the vanquished *adokimos* and be led round the stadium as a slave by his victor.

St. Paul's lesson to the Corinthians is equally applicable to ourselves. It is obvious that the christian must deny himself many things in which the worldlings freely indulge. That is not enough. The avoidance of sin is mere matter of course ; it is the most elementary lesson in the primer of Christianity. The capital, the crucial, point is to guarantee the avoidance of sin. It is not easy. In fact it is desperately

hard. It is a fight to the death with our greatest enemies—ourselves, and it is all the harder because it involves the thwarting of our greatest friends—ourselves.

Surely it is evident. Every sin is a gratification of self. The seven capital sins are the seven heads of the Hydra of self-love. Where there is love of self there is no room for the love of God. No man can serve two masters ; he can but cleave to one alone. The great adversary is self ; it is self that must be overthrown.

But how ? Learn the lesson of the athlete. He goes into training. He gets fit. He gets himself thoroughly well in hand. He learns the stern lesson of saying "No" to himself. He learns discipline. He rigidly eschews all that stands between him and his aim. The christian can do no less. It is, in fact, his primary duty. He cannot even really call himself a christian until he has learned to perform this duty : "If any man will come after Me let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow Me" (Luke ix, 23). Self-denial is the first step in spiritual progress, but it also goes the whole journey. It is at once the preparation for the fight and the lifelong fight itself.

There can be no shirking about it, no half-measures. For self we must have nothing but implacable enmity. Paradoxically, truly to love ourselves we must hate self (Luke xiv, 26 ; John xii, 25). Nor can this hate remain purely theoretical ; it must erupt into action ; that action must be drastic. There can be no question of sparring, of feinting, of shadow-boxing. Self is not to be handled with kid-gloves. It is a ruthless and relentless enemy. It has to be battered as with the brutal caestus until it is overthrown and left, so to speak, unconscious. It has to be killed outright. It must be crucified. "They that are Christ's have crucified their flesh with the vices and concupiscences" (Gal. v, 24).

That is why self-denial is called mortification : it is putting self to death. It is an exacting process ; that is why we must have the will to win. It is hard and painful—that is why the Master describes it as the daily carrying of the cross and His Apostle as actual crucifixion—but, hard and painful as it is, it is paramountly necessary. Unless we kill self, we must ourselves die (Rom. viii, 13).

Now corporal mortification is clearly necessary : we must learn to control our appetites. It must not, however, be unduly stressed. Francis Thompson has wisely remarked in his *Health and Holiness*, that the rigorous bodily self-discipline of our forefathers is hardly suited to our age and our physique. In any case, it is rather interior mortification, especially of the will, that really matters. It is the will that is the father of sin ; it is the will that must particularly be disciplined. "Go not after thy lusts, but turn away from thy own will : if thou give to thy soul her desires she will make thee a joy to thy enemies" (Eccles. xviii, 30, 31).

You do not have to seek far for occasion of mortifying your will. The ordinary daily round, the usual day's routine, will present you unasked with many an opportunity of thwarting your will in every possible way—if you will accept them. The all-important thing to remember is that the follower of Christ must not merely renounce all things—at least, by detachment—he must renounce himself. A man's will is himself ; the self-centred is the self-willed. Discipline your will and you have overcome yourself.

"Son, as much as thou canst go out of thyself so much shalt thou be able to enter into Me" (*Imitation of Christ*).

Sexagesima

If I must needs glory, I will glory of the things that concern my infirmity (II Cor. xi, 30).

The Epistle of today might well be styled the Charter of the Christian. If it be true, as it is true, that humility is the foundation of all virtue, then this amazing "human document" is its adequate expression. It well repays close examination.

St. Paul is contrasting in his subtly ironic way his own bearing and behaviour with the bombast and self-complacency of the Judaists, who were not merely beguiling the unfortunate Corinthians, they were bullying and exploiting them as well. It is important to note first that the Apostle says it is never *expedient* to take any credit to oneself. For this reason, strangely enough, he distinguishes

in his own person two men : the man of visions and the mere man. He says he could rightly glory in his visions because, having contributed nothing of his own, all the glory of them must redound to God. In regard to the man, Paul, he can cherish no conceit as if the fruits of his ministry were due to his own merits and unaided efforts. Rather does he boast, if he must boast, of his own frailty—manifestly revealed in his trials and tribulations through which God alone could have sustained him—since that frailty merely serves to throw into higher relief the might of God, Who by an instrument so imperfect could achieve such results. For himself, he would prefer people to base their estimate of him upon his appearance (and Paul was not particularly prepossessing !) and his speech. He could take no complacency in himself : he was chastened by a handicap so grave that he even prayed God to be delivered of it. God refused him—at least, in the way that he asked—but promised that He would work His ends through him as if he laboured under no kind of disability. Therefore, if he must boast, though it is not expedient, it is of his tribulations—for they all manifest his human weakness and incapacity—so that the power of Christ may continue to abide in him, and everyone recognize that the splendour of his apostolate is due to his Master and not to himself.

It is well to realize at once that, though the Apostle has presented considerations of vital importance, he has left unexpressed, though readily to be inferred, others of equal importance. The first is that the power of God is most gloriously revealed in the humble who, knowing their own limitations, have neither self-complacency nor self-reliance. The second is that all success, whatever its nature, must be attributed to God. It follows, therefore, that all self-conceit is largely born of lies and deception, for, though the facts upon which the fabric of pride is built may be true enough, the interpretation of those facts is most certainly lying. Pride is the setting up of false values ; it is abandoning the gold-standard of sane judgment. Remember that St. Paul was all that the Judaists boasted to be—and more !—but he found no matter for gratification in that. If he found *any* cause for self-congratulation it was in everything that manifested his own weakness and infirmity, because therein

was patently revealed the power of God. Note well that in every single detail St. Paul is attributing everything to God and nothing to himself save his weakness.

That is what makes humility acceptable to God. Humility is the sister of Truth. Humility goes hand in hand with truth, acknowledging always with simplicity and full sincerity that God is Everything and man nothing, attributing to God what there is of merit, and reserving to man only his own defects. God must inevitably love the truth, because He is Truth itself.

Pride is a liar ; pride is also a thief. It usurps what is God's. It steals the glory which is His. It is an idolatry. It sets up the idol of self in the shrine where God should reign. Was not pride the abettor, if not the instigator, of the idolatry that St. Paul scourges in his Epistle to the Romans ? (Rom. i, 21). Pride is the apotheosis of self. When self is deified, God is deposed. That is an outrage upon His Majesty, high treason to the Highest. It seems symptomatic, therefore, that the first sin should have been pride. "Never suffer pride to reign in thy mind, nor in thy words, for from it all perdition took its beginning" (Tob. iv, 13). It still does. All perdition takes its beginning from pride. Every sin involves pride : the preferring of self to God. "Pride comes before a fall" in bitter truth. Pride slams the door in the face of grace, but it flings it wide open to welcome in sin. Little wonder, then, that "God resists the proud and gives His grace to the humble" (James iv, 6) ; that "the proud man is an abomination to the Lord" (Prov. xvi, 2). The proud man, you see, is a devotee of the great god Self.

It is a paradox that pride should be found among christians : disciples forgetting the fundamental lesson of their Teacher (Matt. xi, 29) ; followers deserting the track blazed by their Leader ! It is strange in the ultimate analysis that there should be any such thing as pride. The more we know of God and His infinite perfection, the more we know of self and its endless variety of imperfection, the greater should be our appreciation of the illimitable discrepancy existing between God and man. This dual knowledge is the school of humility. It was there studied the Saints. It was there they learned to disparage themselves in terms that strike extravagant on modern ears. They were

right. God is all : man is nought. Really we have nothing of our own save our own sins and defects. "What hast thou that thou hast not received ? and if thou hast received why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it ?" (I Cor, iv, 7). "How much each one is in Thy eyes, O Lord," said the Poor Man of Assisi, "so much is he and no more." *Non nobis, Domine, non nobis !*

Quinquagesima

Charity . . . beareth all things . . . endureth all things
(I Cor. xiii, 7).

It is a pity that charity should be largely identified in the minds of the faithful with love of neighbour. Charity embraces an infinitely greater, an infinitely more important, love : the love of God. This is the queen of virtues. It is "the greatest and the first commandment" (Matt. xxii, 36).

"Charity beareth all things" because all things come from God, and the love of God makes His true lover realize it and willingly acquiesce. The most signal manifestation of love, even in human affairs, is never to be at variance with the will of the Beloved. Then, if we truly love God we must inevitably see in all things His most holy Will and readily accept whatever befall us as the expression of His Will. Conformity with, resignation to, the Will of God is the best thing we have to offer Him. It is the royal road to the fulfilment of His "greatest and first commandment". "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them ; he it is that loveth Me," He said (John xiv, 21). It is the best proof of our love. God wants our love. He commands it. He even pleads for it : "Son, give me thy heart" (Prov. xxiii, 26). He will be satisfied with nothing less. Clearly, then, if we rebel against His Will, if we even repine, we can only give Him a heart that is divided. Our love of God is blighted by our love of self.

Strange that we should even consider the possibility of repining, much less of rebellion, against the Will of God ! The Will of God must inevitably always be wise, always good, always right ; the Will of God is God Himself, the All-

perfect. It is clearly, then, to our own best interest to resign ourselves to His Will. Resignation to the Will of God is not just philosophical acceptance of the inevitable ; it is the grateful acceptance of the best. Whatever betide is the Will of Our Father, Who is in Heaven.

Actually, in point of reason there is really no other course open to us than resignation. God has the right to demand our acquiescence by right of creation, by right of redemption, by right of our dedication in Baptism. In fact the only purpose of our being, the very reason why we are come into the world, is, as it was with our Master, that we should do and accept, in all things the Will of God. "In the head of the book it is written of me that I should do Thy will" (Ps. xxxix, 8, 9). Thy will be done ! To seek, and accept, the Will of God in all things should be our one desire ; it is certainly our greatest glory. To have no other will but God's is to be most intimately united with Him in love. It is the happy lot of His Saints in heaven.

But God gave us free-will, and the intelligence that should be the lantern to our will is too often clouded. Too often do we fail to discern in the fog of self-love the beacon-truth that nothing happens, save sin, which is not directly willed by God. Then all suffering, all hardship, whatever its nature, must come from God. Even though it be occasioned by the malice or the injustice of sinners, nevertheless, though He detests the sin, God wills the inevitable aftermath. In affliction, therefore, we must perceive the invisible hand of God, not the visible hand of the sinner, and take readily, with no repining, whatever the hand of God holds out to us. We may indeed be chastened by the rod of adversity, but the rod that chastizes us is wielded by our loving Father for our own advantage. Well, then, we must kiss the rod. Besides, whatever happens to us is always for the best. It cannot be otherwise. It comes from the all-good, all-wise Father Who could never dispense to His children "stones" and "serpents" and "scorpions" (Luke xi, 12). His ever to cherish and protect, never to harm and ravage.

He sends us pleasant things ; why should He not also send us bitter ? Have we never needed correction ? Have we never deserved any punishment ? Have we been so utterly without sin that there is due no retribution ? Rather

"I will
against
C
a new
into t
His p
"man
that
all un
order
great
can l
ment
T
hand
gives
scou
stati
tribu
on l
mur
Stor
har
it p
and
resi
frie
to t
and
end
We
gol
bec
nee
rec
jus
W
.
son

"I will bear the wrath of the Lord, because I have sinned against Him" (Mich. vii, 9).

Conformity with the Will of God invests the soul with a new and precious dignity. It wholly surrenders the soul into the hands of God to do with in all things according to His pleasure. It makes the christian, as was David, a "man after God's own heart". It inevitably follows, then, that the soul finds tranquillity, the "peace which surpasseth all understanding", because all things are accepted as being ordered and devised by the All-wise, the All-good, for the greater good. Where there is no other will but God's, there can be no care, no anxiety, no fear, no repining, no resentment. Everything is for the best ; everything is right.

The first-born of this resignation, and its inseparable handmaiden, is Patience, the great christian virtue which gives strength to bear with courage and constancy all the scourges that afflict humanity in all its seven ages in all its stations. The patient christian, neither cast down by tribulation nor disheartened by adversity, marches steadily on his way carrying his cross behind his Master without murmur, without regret. Patience is the Philosopher's Stone of spirituality. It transforms the base metal of hardship and suffering into the pure gold of the supernatural ; it performs the weird alchemy of making heavy things light and bitter things sweet. Its alembic is realization of, and resignation to, the Will of God.

Patience is the supreme following of Christ and of His friends, the Saints and Martyrs, who have "run by patience to the fight proposed to" them, "looking on Jesus, the author and finisher of faith, who, having joy set before Him, endured the cross" (Heb. xii, 1, 2). We must expect trial. We cannot escape tribulation. We must be proved like gold in the crucible. If we survive the refining, it will be because we were sustained by patience. "Patience is necessary for you ; that doing the Will of God, you may receive the promise" (Heb. x, 36).

"Son, when thou comest to the service of God, stand in justice and fear, and prepare thy soul for temptation. . . . Wait on God with patience ; join thyself to God and endure. . . . Take all that shall be brought upon thee, and in thy sorrow endure, and in thy humiliation keep patience : for

gold and silver are tried in the fire ; but acceptable men in the furnace of humiliation" (Eccles. ii, 1-5).

That is why charity, the love of God, beareth all things, endureth all things.

Ash-Wednesday¹

Rend your hearts and not your garments and turn to the Lord your God (Joel ii, 13).

Today we enter the penitential season of Lent. It is in token of this that ashes were placed on your brow. Perhaps its symbolism escaped you. You will recall, though, that it was the custom of the followers of the Old Law to strew ashes on the head and rend their garments at the neck as a sign of sorrow, of mourning, of repentance. That is the significance of the ashes. They are a reminder that, more than ever during this holy season, we are to sorrow for, and repent of, our sins, and to mourn for the grievous affront they have offered to God, the Father of love and grace.

Grave words, too, were spoken to you : "Remember, O Man, that thou art dust and unto dust shalt return." Remember ! It may well be that we have forgotten ; at least, the sharpness of memory may be blunted. Today the Church sounds her reveille to awakening memory. It may be that we have forgotten that all earthly things end in the grave, but the grave is the portal of eternity. We must die—and after death the judgment ! We must answer for our sins at the bar of divine Justice beneath the very eyes of God. Had we forgotten ? Had we forgotten too the monstrosity of sin, the horror even of venial sin ? Had we forgotten that sin is an unspeakable outrage against the majesty of God, an offence so abysmal that only God, Who knows His own perfection, can measure its immensity ? Had we forgotten it is high treason, rank rebellion—attempted humiliation of God by flouting and making a mock of Him, "crucifying again the Son of God and making Him a mockery" ? (Heb. vi, 6) Had we forgotten ?

Then it behoves us to remember. It behoves us to

¹ This sermon can be preached on Ash Wednesday, or, with an easy adaptation, on the First Sunday of Lent.

remember too that in every sin when we turn to the creature we turn our back on the Creator. "Be astonished, O ye heavens. . . . For My people have done two evils. They have forsaken Me, the fountain of living water, and have digged to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water" (Jer. ii, 12). The sinner deserts the Living Spring of the waters of everlasting life ; yes, but he also digs himself a cistern—a very pitfall—which can hold nought but filth and slime exhaling the miasma of eternal death . . . and the habitual sinner wallows in it ! But God does not want the death of the sinner. Strange—you would deem it the only adequate retribution for the monstrous outrage and horror of sin, which surely the Justice of God could never condone but must inevitably exact sternest retribution. Still, there it is. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I desire not the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live" (Ezech. xxxiii, 11).

Supreme clemency ! The death-sentence is rescinded—but on one condition : conversion. We must turn back to God. The reprieve is too merciful to be disregarded ; its condition too easy, too mild, to be refused. "Turn to the Lord your God : for He is gracious and merciful, patient and rich in mercy, and ready to repent of the evil" (Joel ii, 13). What else *could* we do ?

Yes, the prodigal sons must return to their Father, but they must cleave to Him. There can be no looking back. The "husks the swine did eat" must be left behind—for ever. It must be a clean cut with the past. Mere regret for sin, a half-will to a better life, will not suffice. There must indeed be sorrow for sin, but there must also be the stern resolution never to revert. It must be obvious. True sorrow must necessarily include the determination to amend ; no one can really grieve for an offence and yet be prepared, even willing, to repeat the offence. Otherwise is merely to mock the offended.

There must be a change of heart. There must be a change of life. There must be no hankering after the husks ; no trespassing at the broken cisterns. The return of the prodigal must be as wholehearted as it is humble : "Father, I have sinned against Heaven and before Thee. I am not now worthy to be called Thy son" (Luke xv, 21). And the

Father's reply? "Thou hast prostituted thyself to many lovers, nevertheless return to me, saith the Lord, and I will receive thee" (Jer. iii, 1). Then "create a clean heart in me, O God; and renew a right spirit within my bowels. . . . A contrite and humbled heart, O God, thou wilt not despise" (Ps. 1, 12, 19).

And after? When we have returned to God it surely still remains that we make amends to Him for our defection, that we offer some solace for His outraged love. We must make reparation. We must do penance. Had we forgotten too that divine justice must be satisfied either here or hereafter? *Aut poenitendum aut arandum!* Had we forgotten that this idol of self, exalted in sin, must be torn down from its pedestal and shattered?

True repentance must necessarily involve a real hatred and detestation for the sins that have grievously affronted God, infinitely good in Himself and infinitely good to us. It cannot stop there. Inevitably that same hatred and detestation must go on to embrace self-love, the traitor lurking within the gates, the Judas who enticed us to our betrayal of God. True repentance, therefore, of its very nature must excite the urge to chastize and domineer self by penitential exercise and thus make satisfaction for the sins to which self-love has allured us. So it has been with all true penitents; so it must be with us. "Bring forth, therefore, fruits worthy of penance" (Matt. iii, 8). "Thus saith the Lord: Be converted to Me with all your heart in fasting, in weeping and in mourning" (Joel ii, 12).

We must rend, not our garments, but our hearts—repent, not in conventional symbolism, but in sternest reality. The ashes that we strew must come from the holocaust of the idol of self.

J. O. MORGAN.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

DR. KEUPPENS, of the White Fathers, has just published a useful compendium of Mariology which both for its excellence and for its extremely reasonable price deserves to be brought to the attention of our readers.¹ It is admittedly right and just that this section of theology should be regarded as an appendix to the treatise *De Verbo Incarnato*; Our Lady is thus placed in her proper perspective. But it will be admitted likewise that for this very reason Mariology has for many years failed to receive in our text-books that fuller development which, in view of the important progress made by theologians in the study of this subject, it must now be said to merit. It is to be hoped, therefore, that in future the professors of our great Catholic universities, when they give to the world in book form the theological course which has formed the subject of their lectures, will include therein a whole volume devoted to the Mother of God. Something of this sort was in the mind of Dr. Keuppens when he prepared his *Compendium Mariologiae*; and therefore his book may well prove of use to those priests in whose theological course Mariology received, perhaps, little more than a passing notice.

The work is divided into three parts, entitled respectively: *Deipara*, *Mediatrix*, and *Florilegium Mariale*. Of the third little need be said except to recommend it as a very useful collection of texts taken from ecclesiastical or patristic documents, conveniently arranged in chronological order. Of the first two parts we may remark in general that the author's treatment is chiefly explanatory and speculative, comparatively little space being devoted to the citation of patristic authorities—rightly, since abundant material for a positive study is provided in the *Florilegium*. But the speculations of Dr. Keuppens are sober and well founded, being based upon sure principles derived from the revealed word of God. These fundamental principles, together with the

¹ *Compendium Mariologiae*, by J. Keuppens, S.T.D. (Scholasticat des Pères Blancs, Héverlé-Louvain, Belgium. Pp. 241). Obtainable from the author only, 16 fr. belg; 20 copies at 12 fr.

rules for their application, are well and wisely laid down by the author at the beginning of his work, and, what is better, he himself observes the rules he has laid down. There is perhaps no part of theology where devotional zeal is so apt to run away with theological discretion, no subject in which a prudent reserve is so much open to the charge of minimizing. Dr. Keuppens skilfully steers a middle course, and in the questions which divide theologians he gives a very fair summary of the arguments of both sides. The chief matter of debate is, of course, the nature of the universal mediatorship of our Lady. In this question, which more than any other in Mariology occupies the attention of theologians today, Dr. Keuppens favours what may be called the more generous view; he holds that "Our Lady co-operated immediately in objective Redemption inasmuch as, together with Christ but in dependence upon Him, by her satisfaction and merit she paid the price of Redemption and reconciled the human race with God" (pp. 115-116). Our own opinion on the point need not be stated here; but, whether we agree or not with the view towards which Dr. Keuppens inclines, we cannot but commend the exemplary restraint of his conclusion: "*Satis periculosum videtur hanc controversiam categorice dirimere . . . Si tandem licet uni opinioni favere, quin alteri solidam probabilitatem denegemus, concludendum ducimus affirmativam doctrinam sufficienter validis argumentis fulciri ut virum serium ad illam inclinet, immo ut probabilior agnoscatur*" (p. 127).

Attention was called by Dr. Miller, in an able article which he contributed to the August issue of *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, to a number of Scriptural texts which are wrongly quoted by theologians in support of certain dogmas of the faith. He, as well as those to whom his article may have occasioned some salutary heart-searchings on the subject, will read with interest and approval the first volume, recently published, of *Theologia Biblica* by Fr. P. F. Ceuppens, O.P.¹ Fr. Ceuppens is no thoughtless iconoclast; but he insists upon that proper respect to the Word of God which requires that *quidlibet* in the Scriptures should not be used to prove *quodlibet*. This first volume of his series considers in turn, following the order of the *Summa* of St. Thomas, the Scriptural

¹ Angelicum, Rome. Vol. I: *De Deo Uno*. Pp. 329. Price not given.

texts which are commonly used by theologians as arguments in the treatise *De Deo Uno*; and we have no hesitation in saying that theologians will be wise to give due weight to this author's animadversions before they continue to set such store by many of their favourite "proofs from Scripture". At the same time be it said that other common *loci* receive added force from his commentary, and that texts which are ordinarily given little attention are shown by the author to have an important bearing upon dogmas of the faith. It may be of interest in the meantime to mention one or two of the text-book favourites which are not favoured by Fr. Ceuppens. The passage of Baruch (iii, 24-25): "*Quam magna est domus Dei et ingens locus possessionis eius! Magnus est et non habet finem, excelsus et immensus*", often quoted by theologians as a proof of the immensity of God, is in actual fact concerned with the vastness of the universe. "*Ego Dominus, et non mutor*" (Malachy, iii, 6), should not be used to show that the immutability of God is based upon the truth that He is Jahweh (i.e. the subsistent Being), since in this context the words mean only that God is unchanged in His hatred of sin. Equally fatal blows are dealt at the arguments usually adduced in proof of degrees in the Beatific Vision (Matt. xvi, 24-27; John xiv, 2; I Cor. xv, 40-42; II Cor. ix, 6), and at the famous proofs so confidently quoted in connection with "futuribles". With regard to these last, however, it is fair to quote the restrained language of the author: "*Quibus locis*" (I Kings xxiii, 12 ff.; II Kings xiii, 18, 19; Matt. xi, 21) "*consideratis, opinamur quod e S. Scriptura 'certo probari' nequit Deum futura conditionata seu futuribilia certa et infallibili scientia cognoscere*" (p. 175). Theologians will read with particular interest Fr. Ceuppens' excellent treatment of monotheism in the Old Testament, and also his detailed study of the passage in the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans (vv. 6-29) which, though commonly treated as a Scriptural disquisition on predestination, is, according to the author, not directly concerned with that problem at all. Here, again, it will be well to quote his own words: "*Quando ergo hanc pericopam mature consideramus, fatendum est; (1) quod de praedestinatione individuorum ad gloriam non agitur; (2) neque de praedestinatione individuorum ad gratiam; (3) sed de rejectione*

populi judaici a salute messianica et de vocatione gentium ad hanc salutem agitur ; (4) Principia a S. Paulo enuntiata sunt principia generalia, unde ad praedestinationem ad gratiam vel ad gloriam applicari possunt, sed tunc jam in theologia et non amplius in S. Scriptura sumus" (p. 275). We shall look forward with interest and impatience to the succeeding volumes of this series.

Fr. John R. Kelly, S.J., and also the Bruce Publishing Company of Milwaukee, are to be heartily congratulated on the happy completion of a great work. Fr. Kelly's scholarly translation of Fr. Mersch's book, *Le Corps Mystique du Christ* under the title *The Whole Christ*, is well worthy of the original. As the translator remarks in his preface, "the specialist and the scholar will not depend upon a translation ; they will continue to consult the French original". Hence no great damage to the utility of the translation will have resulted from the necessary omission of critical and exegetical notes, references, bibliographies and appendices ; in all essentials Fr. Mersch's book is made accessible to the English reader. Our commendation of this excellent work was given in some detail when it first appeared,² and it applies with equal truth to the English version before us. Of *The Whole Christ* as of *Le Corps Mystique du Christ* we observe that it is "a model of what a study in positive theology ought to be".³

The well-known translation of the works of St. Thomas by the Dominican Fathers has done much to introduce to Thomistic thought many who would otherwise have never made its acquaintance ; and it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of that praiseworthy enterprise. But it still remains true that the average Englishman finds St. Thomas, even in English, very difficult to read. For it is not merely a question of language ; it is above all a question of method and of style. The short, crisp, thought-laden sentences of the *Summa* serve admirably their purpose of conveying in brief and summary form the fruits of a lifetime of meditation upon revealed truth ; the scholastic method is a sure safeguard against the beclouding of vital issues by superfluous rhetoric. But, we repeat, it makes stiff reading. The average reader today, at any rate in this country, is not

¹ London, G. E. Coldwell, Ltd. Pp. xvi and 623. 21s.

² CLERGY REVIEW, VI, 56.

³ Loc. cit., p. 57.

prepared to maintain the tense application of the mind which such a study demands. He likes to feel that he may with impunity miss the point in one paragraph because he will surely find it repeated, under another form, in the next ; he likes the metaphysical tension to be relaxed from time to time with an anecdote or an illustration ; above all he wants to be reassured that the philosophical and theological thought of the Middle Ages is not entirely out of touch with the problems of modern life. Fr. Walter Farrell, O.P., has appreciated this, and his *Companion to the "Summa"* is the result. His work is designed to cover the whole of the *Summa*, and the second volume, *The Pursuit of Happiness*, corresponding to the *I IIae*, is the first to appear.¹ Originally composed as a series of lectures delivered in New York, these chapters are in effect a masterly presentation, in popular but accurate language, of the whole of the ethical doctrine of St. Thomas. And it is a presentation which will be read with ease and with pleasure even by the most indolent of students, because Fr. Farrell has spared no pains in his efforts to captivate sustained attention. Here, the reader will say, is a theological and philosophical treatise on the end of man and the means whereby it may be attained, and yet having none of the aridity of a scientific work ! Nor is there anything "mediaeval" about it ; it seems to be written by one who understands and appreciates the modern mind and the needs of the day. And yet it is pure Thomism. The ingenuity of the author is fully appreciated only when one compares each of these chapters with the corresponding articles of the *Summa* of St. Thomas. The comparison is doubly illuminating ; it shows equally the perennial freshness of Thomistic teaching, and the thoroughness with which Fr. Farrell has understood it.

To all those who are interested—and it is the express wish of the Holy Father that all should be interested—in the Eastern Churches, we heartily recommend the *Compendium Theologiae Orientalis* by Fr. Maurice Gordillo, S.J., professor of Oriental theology at the Institute of Oriental Studies and at the Gregorian University.² After preliminary chapters on the Christian East and its divisions and on the theological

¹ Sheed & Ward, 1938. Pp. viii + 459. 10s. 6d. net.

² Institute of Oriental Studies, Rome, 1937. Pp. 275. 15 lire.

sources used by our dissident brethren, Fr. Gordillo treats in separate chapters of those points of doctrine in which there is a divergence between the Greco-Slavonic Church and ourselves : the primacy of the Sovereign Pontiff, the procession of the Holy Ghost, the Immaculate Conception of our Lady, the Sacraments, Purgatory, and immediate retribution after death ; the book concludes with chapters on the Nestorians and the Monophysites. Fr. Gordillo's treatment is to a great extent historical ; naturally so, because perhaps the chief hope of bringing these unhappy differences to an end lies in a properly understanding how they came about. In the choice of his arguments the author is influenced less by the objective value than by the appeal which they are likely to make to the theologians of the East ; and herein, apart from its purely apologetic utility, lies the chief value of this study giving as it does to the student a closer acquaintance than the ordinary theological manuals provide, with the thought of the early Eastern Fathers.

G. D. SMITH.

II. HOLY SCRIPTURE

Since the publication in the November issue of my account of the Twentieth Congress of Orientalists at Brussels I have received several requests for further information, more especially with regard to Père Roland de Vaux's remarkable paper on early Israelite history. To such kind inquiries I could only answer that the paper would, presumably, appear in some future number of the *Revue biblique*, of which Père de Vaux is now the *directeur*, but that I had no precise information to offer. Those who desire to read a fuller treatment of the Congress than I was able to provide within the narrow limits of a review article will welcome a pamphlet by M. le chanoine J. Coppens entitled *Le XX^e Congrès d'Orientalisme* which gives an excellent summary of many of the papers.¹ M. Coppens makes it clear, however, that his principal concern was with the Old Testament section, since as he remarks, "il aurait fallu un don de multi-location pour pouvoir assister à la fois aux diverses sections

¹ Imprimerie A. Lesigne, Rue de la Charité, Brussels.

relever, dans chacune d'elles, les rapports les plus sensationnels", and adds: "Nous ne possédons même pas le privilège de la bilocation."

We have had to wait four years for the completion of Père F.-M. Abel's *Géographie de la Palestine*, the first volume of which was reviewed in these columns in 1934.¹ This earlier volume was concerned with the physical and historical aspects of the geography of the Holy Land, whereas the present volume completes the survey under the subtitle "Géographie politique. Les villes".² In the notice of the first volume some comparison was attempted with the English work by Sir George Adam Smith entitled *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, of which the so-called twenty-fifth edition (actually the first revised issue since the fourth edition of 1896) appeared in 1932.³ It is not necessary to repeat the comparison here, but it may be noted that the French work, while somewhat deficient in charm, is a far more scholarly and serviceable production than is the book by Sir G. A. Smith. The present volume gives full measure in the author's discussion of the political geography of Palestine, and has chapters on the peopling of Amurru and Canaan in the second millennium, the boundaries of the tribes, political divisions during the period of the Monarchy, the Assyrian provinces, the satrapies under the Persian régime, the divisions in the Hellenistic period, Palestine as part of the Roman province of Syria, ancient ecclesiastical divisions of the Holy Land, and, finally, the Roman roads and the main trade-routes of antiquity. Chapter IX on the ecclesiastical divisions is of particular interest to students of Church history, and is subdivided into sections on the founding of the Palestinian churches, the organization of the churches up to the Council of Nicaea, the bishoprics of Palestine in the Byzantine period, and survivals and modifications of the Byzantine organization.

The second part of this volume (which is, in effect, the fourth part of the work as a whole) is concerned with the towns, or, more exactly, with "villes bibliques et autres localités historiques". This is not, as might perhaps be

¹ Vol. VII, pp. 426-28.

² J. Gabalda, Paris, 1938. Pp. viii + 538. Price 150 fr.

³ See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. III, p. 152.

expected, a general discussion of the construction and manner of life of Palestinian towns in antiquity, but is an alphabetical list, extending to nearly 260 pages, of all the chief places of interest. In most cases there is a discussion of the site, historical significance, biblical references, and excavations in respect of any particular town, and many of the entries (e.g. Emmaus, Jericho, Jerusalem, Megiddo, Neapolis, Salem, Samaria, etc.) are in the nature of miniature treatises on the towns in question. At the foot of each entry is a compact bibliography with references to recent articles and monographs. Those who are aware that much of the best work on the identification and historical importance of the Palestinian towns is hidden away in back numbers of periodicals will welcome this survey by one of the foremost living experts on Palestinian geography and topography, which provides, *inter alia*, some foretaste of the much-needed general index to the *Revue biblique*. It is safe to say that Père Abel's two magnificent volumes will find a place in a small and select portion of a scriptural library reserved for works that are really indispensable. It may perhaps be regretted that the ten excellent folding maps have not been numbered on the outside folds, but this is a defect that can easily be made good by the owners of the second volume, at the end of which these maps are to be found.

The work of Dom Hilaire Duesberg, monk of Maredsous, is well-known to all readers of the *Revue bénédictine*, and his fame as a *conférencier* is recognized in the learned centres of Brussels, Ghent, Louvain and Paris. He has now published the substance of his recent conferences under the title *Les scribes inspirés, introduction aux livres sapientiaux de la Bible*,¹ and this, the first of two volumes, is mainly occupied with the content and doctrine of the book of Proverbs. It is a work of great interest to students of the Wisdom literature, and is buttressed but not weighed down by much solid learning and by the study of an immense quantity of the relevant literature. Starting with the general idea of Wisdom in the ancient literatures of the East, Dom Hilaire gives a clear and admirably documented account of the object of the Egyptian wisdom, the wisdom literature of the Egyptian scribes and the doctrine contained in their books. Though

¹ Desclée de Brouwer, Paris, 1938. Pp. 592. Price 100 fr.

not himself an expert Egyptologist, he has had the assistance of M. Jean Capart, the founder of the Bibliothèque d'Égyptologie at Brussels, and of other specialists, thanks to whom, he informs us in his preface, "J'ai été à même de contrôler mes textes et de regarder au delà des traductions reçues". From Eastern Wisdom literature in general the author passes to Solomon, the paragon of all scribes, and discusses Yahweh's gift of wisdom to the king, and the wisdom manifested by Solomon in his administration and in the writings attributed to him. Finally, in the third and much the longest section of the book, Dom Hilaire, after devoting some attention to the royal scribes in Israel and Juda, gives a long and carefully reasoned introduction to Proverbs before he determines the *destinataires* of the book, the traces of foreign influence that are to be found in it, and the gradual transition in the exilic and post-exilic periods "des scribes du roi aux scribes de la Loi".

This is a work that cannot be adequately summarized and must be read as a whole, as befits an introduction to a whole system of theology and ethics. One of the many pleasing features of the book is the author's graceful and accomplished translation of the Hebrew text of Proverbs which makes a wise use of textual emendation and brings out the rhythm of the original. There is a full index to the biblical quotations, which is also (a rare merit!) an index to the corrections proposed. One complaint must, however, be voiced, in particular with regard to the long central section of the "Introduction au livre des Proverbes", namely that more use should have been made of page-headings or inset summaries to direct the reader's attention to the various divisions of the subject-matter. As there is no index of subjects it is sometimes difficult to turn back to the page on which a particular topic is treated. It is to be hoped that this will be remedied in the second volume on the remaining sapiential books, the publication of which, it is safe to say, will be eagerly awaited by all attentive readers of the present volume.

The need of a good harmony or synopsis of the Gospels is felt by most, if not all, students of Holy Scripture, and there are quite a number of excellent editions in Greek or in modern languages. Until recently, however, it was not too

easy to find a satisfactory harmony in Latin which includes the complete text of all four Gospels. The *Evangeliorum Synopsis* of Camerlynck, now in its fourth edition (1931), does not profess to include more than the passages from St. John which are strictly parallel with the text of the Synoptics, and the Abbé A. Brassac's *Nova Evangeliorum Synopsis* (Paris, 1913), does not appear to be still in print. Hence the appearance of Dr. Johannes Perk's *Synopsis Latina quatuor evangeliorum secundum vulgatam editionem*¹ is all the more welcome. The publishers are fully entitled to claim that their Synopsis is "distinguished from all others by its excellent print and artistic get-up", even though Camerlynck's edition does not lag far behind it in this respect. On the other hand, they are not entitled to say that "for the first time we have here a Latin Synopsis for Students of Theology, the secular clergy, and those of the Religious Orders", unless it can be shown that the earlier Latin *synopses* were in some mysterious way unsuitable for one or other of these classes of readers! Perhaps, as the book was printed in Germany, they mean that this is the first German work of the kind. In any event, the book appears to be a well-conceived and scholarly arrangement of the text, and it is equipped with a number of useful indexes and tables, e.g. a chronological table for the New Testament, a similar scheme for the public ministry, "Judaeorum secundum Joannem festorum tabula", an index to the passages from the Gospels used in the Missal, and an index to the main topics mentioned in the Gospels. There are also a reproduction of a page of the Codex Vaticanus, a couple of maps, and a short treatment of the Synoptic problem.

It is almost needless to add that the author's arrangement of his text does not please at least one reader in every respect. So, to take one example, it seems a pity to have a section (216) entitled "Altera negotiantium e templo ejecti" to accommodate the three Synoptic passages regarding the casting out of the sellers. No doubt the author could quote in his favour the high authority of the late Dom Hildebrand Höpfl, O.S.B., who in his *Tractatus de Inspiratione Sacrae*

¹ See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. III, pp. 521-22.

² London agents, Geo. Coldwell Ltd., 1935. Pp. 52.+160. Price 5s. 6d.

Scripturae et Compendium Hermeneuticae Biblicae Catholicae,¹ declares that "Ejectio vendentium e templo apud Synopticos differt ab illa narrata in quarto Evangelio", quoting not a few Catholic writers (Knabenbauer, Belser, Tillmann, Dausch) on the same side. Yet it is of this passage that Père Lagrange wrote in his *Evangile selon Saint Jean*² that : "Ce point doit être résolu comme tout le monde le résout dans une histoire sérieuse. 'On ne peut guère raisonnablement soutenir cette répétition.' (Levesque, *Nos quatre évangiles*, p. 62, n. 1) ; c'est une question de dignité pour l'exégèse catholique." Similarly, the editor fails to invert the order of Chapters V and VI in St. John, and so produces the usual crop of chronological problems. Yet of both these points it must be added that the editor is fully entitled to his opinion, even though here and elsewhere his arrangement will not take everybody's fancy.

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

¹ Rome, 1923, p. 201.

² Paris, 1925, p. 64.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MASS WITH LEAVENED BREAD.

Everyone knows that unleavened bread is valid matter but the manualists do not discuss very fully whether leavened bread may be used in a case of necessity, e.g. in order that the people may observe the Sunday precept if, by a mischance, a host of unleavened bread cannot be obtained. (V)

REPLY.

Canon 816: "In Missae celebratione sacerdos, secundum proprium ritum, debet panem azymum vel fermentatum adhibere ubicumque Sacrum litet."

Missale Romanum, *De Defectibus* III, n. 3: ". . . similiter si non sit azymus, secundum morem Ecclesiae Latinae conficitur, sed conficiens graviter peccat."

Canon 866, §3: "Sanctum Viaticum moribundis in proprio accipiendum est; sed, urgente necessitate, fas est quolibet ritu illud accipere."

The older authors gave only one example of the necessity which permits leavened bread, namely, the case mentioned in the Missal *De Defectibus*, III, n. 5, when it is detected either before or after the consecration that the host is of invalid matter, for example, that it is corrupt. The necessity is that the sacrifice should be completed, and if no unleavened bread is available, leavened should be used. This is the only example given by most of the modern authors following St. Alphonsus, e.g. Noldin, Vol. III, n. 107.

Cappello gives a second case of necessity—the need of administering Viaticum to a dying person. He argues from Canons 851 and 866, which contain the milder modern discipline permitting Viaticum to be administered, in a case of necessity, by a Latin priest "in fermentato". The canons, of course, refer to administering Holy Communion, not to saying Mass, but he argues from this rule that saying Mass "in fermentato" is permitted in a case of extreme necessity for the purpose of administering Viaticum. Tummolo-Iorio agrees that this opinion is probable.¹ All the older authors

¹ *Compendium*, Vol. II, n. 278.

expressly denied that the necessity of Viaticum justified celebrating Mass "in fermentato",¹ and the modern manualists we have consulted follow this teaching with the exception of the two authors mentioned. If such extreme necessity does not justify the use of leavened bread, in the opinion of most writers, it is obvious that less urgent necessities do not; for example, the case put in this question, or the case of a priest travelling in parts where there are no Latin churches. The reason is the predominance of the rule that a priest may not celebrate except in his own rite.

We must conclude, therefore, that if no unleavened bread is obtainable, the people must forego their Sunday obligation. This positive law is of lesser gravity than the law of using unleavened bread in the Western Church. Actually, it is a fairly simple matter to make a paste of flour and water and cook it by spreading it on a heated metal plate. The necessity of Viaticum might conceivably be so urgent that there would be no time to do this, and we agree with the authors mentioned that unleavened bread may then be used.

E. J. M.

HOLY COMMUNION BEFORE REQUIEM.

Information is sought on two minor points: (1) When Holy Communion is distributed before a Requiem Mass, should the blessing be given at the end? (2) If distributed whilst not vested for Mass on All Souls Day, what colour should the stole be? (X.)

REPLY.

Ad 1. *Rit. Rom.*, Tit. iv, cap. ii, n. 13: ". . . omissis tamēn semper *alleluia* et benedictione in fine, si paramenta nigri coloris adhibeantur." *S.R.C.*, 26 November, 1878 (n. 3465) directed that the appropriate versicle and prayer is to be said, in these circumstances, during Paschal time, but the *Alleluia* omitted as the rubric of the Ritual determines.

Ad 2. *S.R.C.*, 19 April, 1912 (n. 4289 ad ii): "Utendum colore violaceo, aut albo". Of the two *Rituale Romanum*, Tit. iv, cap. ii, n. 1 seems to prefer the first: "*stola coloris*

¹ E.g. Gasparri, *De Eucharistia*, n. 804.

semper albi vel Officio illius diei convenientis (mutato tamen colore nigro in violaceum die Commemorationis Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum).

E. J. M.

COMMUNION OF SICK PERSONS.

Is there not a new rite which simplifies the administration of Holy Communion to several sick people? A recently printed *Rituale Romanum* (1935) does not mention it. (W.O.)

REPLY.

Tit. iv, cap. iv of the *Rituale Romanum*, in n. 17 and n. 22 takes some account of several sick persons being in the same room, and the prayers are varied accordingly. If they are occupying different rooms in the same building, the authors used to teach that it was necessary to repeat the whole rite in each room, unless the occupants of the other rooms could see or hear to some extent the rite performed in the first room.¹ A new rule making this repetition unnecessary was given in an Instruction S.R.C., 9 January, 1929.² The last reform of the *Rituale Romanum* was in 1925, and the recent Instruction is not included in it because no publisher may make any changes or improvements in the book until authorized by the Holy See. All editions must conform to the *editio typica*.

The substance of the Instruction given in 1929 is as follows: "Quando sacra Communio distribuitur pluribus infirmis, qui in eadem domo, vel in eodem hospitali, sed in distinctis cubiculis degant, Sacerdos vel Diaconus ministrans, in primo tantum cubiculo recitet plurali numero omnes preces ante infirmorum Communionem dicendas iuxta *Rituale Romanum*, Tit. iv, cap. iv; in aliis cubiculis dicat tantummodo preces: *Miseratur tui . . . Indulgentiam . . . Ecce Agnus Dei . . .*, semel *Domine non sum dignus . . . Accipe frater (soror) . . .* vel *Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi . . .*, et in ultimo cubiculo addat versum: *Dominus vobiscum cum suo responsorio et cum sequente oratione plurali numero dicenda: Domine Sancte . . .*, ibique, si qua parti-

¹ Génicot, *Theol. Moralis*, ed. 8, II n. 188.

² A.A.S., 1929, XXI, p. 75; *Periodica*, 1929, p. 111.

cula consecrata superfuerit, benedictionem eucharisticam impertiatur, ac tandem reliquas preces praescriptas in Ecclesia de more persolvat."

To observe this rite correctly there should be in each room a table prepared with a cloth and two candles ; also a purificatory, unless it is carried from each room. Holy Water is required only in the first room.

E. J. M.

FORM OF OFFICE.

ALBAN, a secular priest, with the permission of his Bishop, is staying at a Benedictine monastery for the purpose of teaching in a school, and lecturing in Theology. He also does occasional duty as a supply in parishes and missions served by the monastery, and in secular parishes. When in the monastery he sometimes assists at the monastic office, substituting their office for the secular office on these occasions. May he adopt the monastic office for those hours which he is obliged to say privately ? Further, when he uses the secular office, should he follow the calendar of his diocese, or that of the monastery, or that of the diocese in which the monastery is situated ?

H. W.

REPLY.

It is the ordinary teaching of the manualists that *devotionis causa*, two or three times a year, a priest may depart from the office which he is bound to recite and choose another.¹ Apart from this concession, which needs no explaining, the question set may be solved by distinguishing between the form of Office and the Calendar followed.

(1) With regard to the form of the Office, i.e. the Breviary used, the principle is still that which was formulated by Pius V in his reform of the Breviary, namely, that all are bound to use the Roman Breviary except those churches and religious Orders which had enjoyed their own approved breviary for two hundred years previously, that is to say,

¹ Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1938, XIV, p. 449.

from before the year 1368. This decree is printed in the *Pars Hiemalis* of the present Breviary. The authors, nevertheless, used to teach quite commonly that secular clergy assisting in the choral office of a monastery could follow a form alien to their own breviary, since the public recitation of Office is more solemn and devotional than its private recitation. This teaching can no longer be accepted. A direction of S.R.C., 27 January, 1899, decided against it: "An satisfacit obligationi suae Clericus in Ordinibus Sacris constitutus, qui sponte vel invitatus se adiungit clero, Officium ab Officio ipsius clerici diversum canenti vel recitanti? Resp. Generaliter Negative."¹ The word "generaliter" allows for the exceptions *devotionis causa* and, also, for cases where particular indults have been obtained. In 1908 Abbot Hemptinne of St. Anselmo obtained an indult of this kind for priests attached to the service of any Benedictine monastery, but only for choral office: "S.R.C. utendo facultatibus sibi specialiter a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Papa X tributis, attentis expositis, benigne indulisit, ut, ad proximum decennium, quicumque Presbyteri ad Coenobia monachorum Confoederationis Benedictinae quavis ex causa confluunt, in Choro tantummodo, persolvere Horas Canonicas iuxta ritum respectivi Coenobii." The indult was for ten years and it is not contained in the *Decreta Authentica* S.R.C., but it may be seen in *Periodica* 1908, Vol. IV, p. 286; it is still referred to by the writers and we learn from Dom Steuart's *Benedictine Manual*, p. 106, that it has been extended till 1939; no doubt, it will be further extended. Similar indults exist for the tertiaries of other religious institutes, such as the Franciscans, or may easily be obtained by individuals, e.g. Dominican tertiaries, on applying to the major superiors of the Order.² We are of the opinion that a beneficed priest is not included in these indults, since it has been repeatedly decided that he is bound to the office of his own church wherever he may happen to be living.³ But, inasmuch as it is entirely a question of indult, no certain solution can be given except by consulting the text.

(2) The question of what calendar should be followed is simpler. The priest, it appears, has a quasi-domicile in the

¹ n. 4011 ad III.

² Cf. *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1931, p. 63.

³ E.g. n. 2682 ad 46; 4194 ad 8.

monaste
ing to
the pla
in whic
calenda
the mo
the sim
calenda
monast
hand,
follow

W
other
made
custor

C
ment
ac di
ulla
C
eo P
quan
tizat
A
infar
eoru
prae
desc
I
ques
prop
bap

monastery, and it is more correct—even obligatory according to most writers—that he should follow the calendar of the place in which he is living¹ unless he has a benefice, in which case he must follow that of his own church. The calendar will be that of the monastery if he is entitled to use the monastic breviary. If he is using the Roman Breviary, the simplest solution is that he should follow the diocesan calendar, since it is not certain that he is attached to the monastic church by any canonical title.² On the other hand, indults often permit visitors in religious houses to follow the calendar of the religious Institute. E. J. M.

REGISTRATION OF BAPTISM.

With reference to the baptism of children in churches other than their own parish church, should the entry be made in the register of the church of baptism or is this custom rather an abuse amongst us? W. E.

REPLY.

Canon 777 § 1 : "Parochi debent nomina baptizatorum, mentione facta de ministro, parentibus ac patrinis, de loco ac die collati baptismi, in baptismali libro sedulo et sine ulla mora referre."

Canon 778 : "Si baptismus nec a proprio parochi nec eo praesente administratus fuerit, minister de ipso collato quamprimum proprium ratione domicilii parochum baptizati certiore reddat."

Rituale Romanum, Tit. II, cap. ii, n. 34 : "Antequam infans ex ecclesia asportetur, aut susceptores discedant, eorum nomina, et alia de administrato Baptismo ad praescriptam formam in Baptismali libro Parochus accurate describat."

Private Reply *S. C. Concilii*, 31 January, 1927. To a question whether the registration devolved on the *parochus proprius* of the baptized person, or on the priest of the place of baptism, the answer, given in Italian, was that it seemed

¹ Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, October, 1938, p. 359.

² Cf. n. 4043 ad 1 and 2872 ad 1.

evident from the wording of the Canon that the parish priest who administers baptism should register it and should send the parish priest of the domicile a simple notification.

(1) Although Canon 777 does not expressly decide the point, we think that the custom amongst us of registering the baptism in the church of administration is not an abuse but a correct observance of the common law. This may be deduced from the rubric in the Ritual which requires the registration to be made before the parties leave the church; also, on analogy with canon 1103 which clearly supposes that, in the case of marriage, the details will be entered in the register of the place where the marriage was celebrated. The reply of the *Sacred Congregation of the Council*, though not officially published, is an authoritative interpretation of the law until a contrary interpretation is officially given. The manualists do not discuss the matter very fully; they usually suppose that the registration will be in the church of baptism and a simple notification sent to the priest of the domicile informing him of the fact, that is to say, they do not require all the details to be sent to him. We know of only one author who requires the registration to be made in the register of the parish of the domicile.

(2) A matter which is, perhaps, undetermined by the common law, may be settled by local legislation. The Vich Malines Provincial Council, 1938, recalls the obligation of Canon 778 and rules that, in the case of baptisms taking place in Institutions, the details are to be recorded in the register of the Institution and also sent to the proper parish priest, "qui parochi illos baptismos in suis registris parochialibus statim inscribant. Hi parochi, non autem rectores institutorum, testimonia baptismi dare debent" (p. 111). A more explicit local rule which covers the question put is contained in the Synodal Decrees of Middlesborough (n. 94): "Peregrini should go to their own pastor to be baptized solemnly. If this cannot be easily done, any parish priest may, in his own territory, solemnly baptize the peregrini" (Can. 738, § 2). "In this case one must, however, as soon as possible, inform the parish priest of the domicile of the one baptized, so that the entry may be made in the parochial register" (Can. 778).

E. J. M.

¹ Bouscaren, *Digest*, Vol. II, p. 74.

BAPTISM AND PARENTAL CONSENT.

A GIRL aged thirteen, being educated with Catholics in a convent school, urgently desires to be received into the Church—she is not baptized—but the father will not consent. Is it permitted to baptize her in spite of this?

(A. W.)

REPLY.

Canon 745 §2.2 : "Adulti autem censentur, qui rationis usu fruuntur ; idque satis est ut suo quisque motu baptismum petat et ad illum admittatur."

In itself, the lawful reception of baptism on the part of one who has reached the age of reason does not require the consent of parents. It is a matter gravely affecting personal salvation, and a human being with the use of reason needs the consent of no one in order to obey the divine law. Similarly, in principle, the minister is bound to baptize a person who seeks this sacrament with proper knowledge and dispositions. "Filii infidelium vel haereticorum, si adultam aetatem sint adepti, i.e. rationis usum habeant, possunt, absque parentum iniuria, baptizari, non obstante dictorum parentum reluctantia."¹

But, owing to accidental circumstances and contingencies, an act which is *per se* lawful may rightly be delayed. Some writers, as Génicot, hold that if there is no danger of death, to delay baptism is not gravely sinful, unless it is done out of contempt.² What length of time constitutes a grave neglect cannot be determined from the divine law, and the Church, it appears, is not competent to determine the matter since she has no jurisdiction over unbaptized persons. Other manualists hold that it is a grave breach of the divine law to delay Baptism until there is danger of death, since Christ wishes all men to belong to the visible Church during their span of human life.³ It is agreed amongst all the writers that it cannot be determined how soon a person, who

¹ De Smet, *De Sacramentis*, n. 297.

² *Theol. Moral.*, II, n. 149 ; St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 6, art. 5.

³ Cf. Noldin, *Theol. Moral.*, II, n. 73 ad 2.

has decided to be baptized, is bound *sub gravi* to receive the sacrament.

Not only may baptism be delayed without grave sin, but without any sin at all, if circumstances justify the delay ; and it may actually be virtuous, because prudent, to defer the time of baptism. Considerations which would point to such a decision are the subsequent danger of perversion in a child who is baptized in spite of its parents' wishes, and the possibility of grave harm falling on the church through such a practice, which may be against the civil law. These are the considerations contained in a reply of the Holy Office, 21 July, 1880 : "An tuto admitti possit ad fidei catholicae professionem puella decem annorum in monasterio degens, eiusdem patre haeretico invito. *Resp.* Curet prius Vicarius Ap. totis viribus consensum patris puellae obtinere : si consensus non obtineatur, perpendat serio incommoda quae ex talis puellae admissione in Ecclesiam provenire praevideantur tum quoad periculum proximum perversionis eiusdem puellae, tum quoad grave damnum scholae ac missionis catholicae ; et quatenus nulla, aut spernanda incommoda praevideantur, eandem admittat sine mora : quatenus vero gravia praevideantur incommoda futura, eiusdem admissionem ad formalem et publicam professionem fidei catholicae differat, nisi periculum mortis immineat ; et interim curet eam hortari ut in bono proposito perserveret, atque Deum precetur ut obstacula omnia auferre dignetur ; simulque curet ut ipsa in monasterio manere pergat, et tali modo suam educationem catholicam compleat et perficiat."¹

E. J. M.

MARRIAGE IN A HOUSE.

After obtaining the necessary dispensation, at the instance of one of the parties, the other party declines to come to the church to revalidate the marriage, but is willing to renew consent privately at home. Would this be valid and lawful?

(M. O.)

REPLY.

Canon 1109 §1 : Matrimonium inter catholicos celebratur in ecclesia paroeciali . . . §2 : Matrimonium in

¹ *Fontes*, IV, n. 1066.

medibus privatis celebrari Ordinarii locorum in extra-
ordinario tantum aliquo casu et accedente semper iusta ac
rationabili causa permittere possunt . . . §3 : Matrimonia
vero inter partem catholicam et partem acatholicam extra
ecclesiam celebrentur ; quod si Ordinarius prudenter
iudicet id servari non posse quin graviora oriantur mala,
prudenti eius arbitrio committitur hac super re dispensare,
firmo tamen praescripto can. 1102 §2.

i. The law makes a distinction between the marriages of
Catholics and mixed marriages. In the above canon,
§2 clearly refers to the marriage of two Catholics. Per-
mission from the Ordinary is required for its lawful cele-
bration in a house ; without this permission it is valid,
though unlawful, provided the house is within the territory
of the parish priest or delegate who assists.¹

ii. From §3 of the canon, the common law does not
permit marriage between a Catholic and a non-Catholic in
a church. But, as happens in many dioceses in this country,
the Ordinary uses the powers given him and either permits
or directs that these marriages are to be celebrated in a
church or in the sacristy. Therefore, unless local law
provides to the contrary, we think that no special permission
from the Ordinary is required in order validly and lawfully
to assist at such marriages in a house. Cf. Tummolo-Iorio,
Vol. II, n. 855 : "Quid agendum, si una pars vel utraque
consentiat ad consensum coram parochio renovandum, sed
renewat pergere ad Ecclesiam? Resp. Coniungendi sunt in
sua ipsorum domo vel alio loco ab ipsis electo, dummodo
adsint testes graves, quorum ope convalidatio huius matri-
monii fieri possit publica, si hoc ad tollendum scandalum sit
necessarium. . . ."

E. J. M.

¹ Cf. Gougnard, *De Matrimonio*, pp. 531, 533.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

"NUNTIIUS RADIOPHONICUS. A beatissimo patre ad omnes ecclesiae catholicae filios et ad orbem universum datus, die XXIX Septembris anno MCMXXXVIII, in festo dedicationis S. Michaëlis Archangeli." (A.A.S. XXX, 1909, p. 309.)

Mentre milioni di uomini vivono ancora in ansia per l'incombente pericolo di guerra e per la minaccia di stragi e rovine senza esempio, Noi accogliamo nel Nostro cuore paterno la trepidazione di tanti Nostri figli e invitiamo Vescovi, Clero, Religiosi, fedeli ad unirsi a Noi nella più fiduciosa insistente preghiera per la conservazione della pace nella giustizia e nella carità. A questa inerme ma invincibile potenza della orazione ricorra ancora una volta il popolo fedele, affinchè quel Dio nelle cui mani sono le sorti del mondo, sostenga specialmente in questi momenti i Governanti la fiducia nelle vie pacifiche di leali trattative di accordi duraturi ed ispiri a tutti, pari alle ripetute parole di pace, sentimenti ed opere atte a favorirla e a fondarsi sulle sicure basi del diritto e degli insegnamenti evangelici.

Indicibilmente grati per le preghiere che per Noi sono state fatte e si fanno dai fedeli di tutto il mondo cattolico a questa vita, che in grazia di tali preghiere il Signore Ci ha concesso e quasi rinnovato, Noi di tutto cuore offriamo per la salute e per la pace del mondo, o che il Signore della vita e della morte voglia toglierci l'inestimabile già lungo dolore della vita o voglia invece prolungare ancor più la giornata di lavoro all'afflitto e stanco Operaio. La nostra offerta è tanto più fiduciosa di essere benignamente accolta perchè fatta nella memoria liturgica del mite ed eroico martire San Venceslao, va incontro alla festa del Santo Rosario, alla celebre Supplica, al mese sacro al Santo Rosario, quando in tutto il mondo cattolico si moltiplicherà, come anche vivamente raccomandiamo, il fervore e la frequenza della devozione, che già ha ottenuto così grandi e così benefici interventi della Vergine Santa nelle sorti della tribolata umanità. È colla piena fiducia che questi richiami Ci ispirano che diamo a tutta la grande famiglia cattolica ed alla famiglia umana tutta quanta la Nostra paterna Benedizione.

Benedictio Dei omnipotentis, Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, descendat super vos et maneat semper.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT

THE USE AND ABUSE OF FLOWERS

FLOWERS on the altar are permitted by the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* provided that they be natural or of silk, and are used, "studiose", with discretion (C. Ep. L.I, c-xii). The context implies that the correct position for the vessels containing the flowers is between the candlesticks. In this there is at least a suggestion that the number of such vases should be limited to one row.

The following is a summary of legislative directions drawn from the *Caeremoniale* and various decrees of the R.C. It is forbidden to decorate the altar with flowers for the Office of the Dead or for Requiem Masses ; during the seasons of Advent and Lent, excepting on Gaudete and Laetare Sundays. They are allowed during March by reason of the devotion to St. Joseph ; also at a First Communion Mass during the penitential seasons ; at the Forty Hours, should they be observed during those seasons ; at the Mass of Maundy Thursday and at the altar of Repose ; at the Mass of Holy Saturday.

It is strictly forbidden to set flowers on top of the tabernacle or in front of the door.

As recently as 1932 the Cardinal Vicar of Rome ordered that artificial flowers, whether of cloth, brass, bronze, paper, wax, or any other material whatsoever, should be removed once from the churches of the City, and forbade their future use. We may presume that the Cardinal's orders are not in conflict with the ancient text of the *Caeremoniale* which allows flowers of silk. In matters liturgical what has been ordered for Rome sets the example for the rest of the world : fortunately for us in England, artificial flowers have never found much favour. We have heard also that every year the Cardinal Vicar sends a circular to the parish priests of Rome during Lent, reminding them that they do not increase the honour of God by turning the altar of Repose into a flower-show. There appears to be a doubt as to whether it is permissible to set potted flowers upon the altar ; the point has not been settled by authority, and learned authors are divided in opinion ; all agree that they may be placed upon the floor of the sanctuary.

If official directions in this question of flowers are but and negative more than positive, it is surely because the safest guide is to be found in good taste and its near relative common sense. Flowers are never seen on the altars of the great churches of Rome, and the reason for this is that they are so grand and dignified in themselves that they cannot be improved by such meagre decoration as pots and flowers can supply. The only way to produce any kind of effect on an altar of monumental character, having a fine civory, is by setting large bunches in vases of appropriate size between the candlesticks; small bulbous brass pots containing a few flowers apiece only look ridiculous. In this case the better mode of decoration, and here we have the example of Westminster, is masses of flowers banded up on the floor and on the steps at the sides.

Similarly, an altar which has a richly coloured and decorative reredos, or even a dossal, needs only a few empty filled vessels to attract attention to its loveliness. To pile up vases of flowers one tier above another, on stands and temporary shelves, until the panels of the reredos and the folds of the dossal are almost completely obscured, is plainly a violation of all the canons of good taste and common sense. An altar which is a pyramid of flowers is badly decorated, and a distraction rather than an aid to devotion. Better results would be obtained if the clergy themselves were to decorate their altars instead of leaving it to the holy women, whether they be nuns or secular. Women take it for granted that ability to decorate is their by birthright; in point of fact men are the most skillful exponents of all decorative arts. The ladies of the parsonage may be very good at arranging their drawing-rooms and dining-room tables, but a totally different sense of decoration is required if one is to decorate an altar.

Those cumbersome and ugly earthenware pots below the aspidistra-minded are utterly unsuitable for the decoration of an altar or a sanctuary.

If flowers are used the water should be changed every day, and drooping blooms should be removed.

J. P. R.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Jacobean Age. By David Mathew, Litt.D., M.A.
F.S.A. Pp. 354 with illustrations. (Longmans. 15s.)

ONE must confess to approaching Dr. Mathew's latest work with a certain prejudice provoked by an early newspaper review whose exotic phrasing and highly sweetened laudations (used incidentally to advertise the book) do less than justice to the author's deep scholarship and balanced judgement.

This is a close study of the first quarter of seventeenth-century England, a period well described as "an Elizabethan afterglow, the confused reflection of a Court epoch which had been at once sceptical and aggressive, artificial, tired, prodigal and consciously heroic".

The Jacobean mind was fundamentally complacent. The absence of war deepened men's reverence for the monarchy and fostered the growth of non-political landed influence from which emerged a sense of corporate family dynasty that was to have a far-reaching effect on the later history of England.

Careful reading of unpublished papers at Hatfield House has given Dr. Mathew material for a fresh survey of the trend of political development over this period and of the routine of administrative government centred in the second Cecil, whose "decisions bear the mark of a subdued efficiency which was only saved from grimness by his strange pacific courtesy". This efficiency, contrasting well with the King's lethargy and aided by his unending sources of information, gave Cecil a power that forced the greatest to come to him hat in hand. This same quality retained for him the confidence of the King and enabled him to show indulgence on occasion even to the Catholic Recusants, despite his dislike for them as a dissident minority. It was more important for him to possess than to use his power of striking. There was something alarming in his self-command, his clear vision, his ability to play with and up to the King.

In the two Cecils is seen that close bond between secular and ecclesiastical authority that was the outcome of the Anglican Settlement and that is evidenced in the ponderous preface to the Jacobean Bible. This Erastian spirit was now

penetrating through the whole ruling class and was particularly prominent in the King, whose religion was thus "acknowledged by our Acts of Parliament". "Sagacious, deep and impenetrable, but he was also eminently safe. His theological interests were of a character to lull the suspicions of all who were politically significant."

Dr. Mathew rightly discounts Catholic hopes of the King's conversion as the natural optimism of a minor misled by the royal interest in the Tridentine polity, which, however, attracted him more for its monarchical than its dogmatic concepts. He might have added that the natural vanity of the amateur controversialist (and James was immensely proud of his duels with Bellarmine and Suarez) places an almost insuperable barrier to any conversion.

On the delicate subject of James's relations with his favourites Dr. Mathew shows commendable restraint in disallowing the well-known charges in general for lack of evidence and, with regard to Buckingham, fixing on paternalism as the essential quality of the King's attitude.

The same sober assessment is made of the favourite's rise to power, so often described as meteoric. "His introduction to the inner life of the Court was carefully planned, but his rise was gradual . . . there was nothing cataclysmic about Buckingham's career except the end." In Sir Henry Wotton's words, the King resolved "to make him a masterpiece and to mould him, as it were, platonically to his own idea".

Passing over his considerable achievements unnoticed, Dr. Mathew is perhaps over-severe on Buckingham for not "appreciating the sharpness of political reality", and seems to want to saddle him with "the fact that King Charles's values were so often those of a dream-world". One is more inclined to believe in a good deal of political shrewdness behind the favourite's "free and frolicke stile". Regarding the friendship with Charles, Dr. Mathew says that "the slow rate of the latter's mental growth explains the fact that their companionship appears so equal". As it was Charles and not Buckingham who was the younger by eight years one fails to understand this remark.

As for the favourite's family, one agrees that there was "no dynastic quality in the Villiers; they were *arriviste* and

without roots, amiable and grasping". Yet they are grouped in a chapter headed "The Villiers Faction", though this last word is defined in the *Oxford Dictionary* as a self-interested, turbulent or unscrupulous party, especially in politics. The family would have been flattered by the term.

One is similarly misled by other chapter-headings. "The Nature of Political Influence" promises something more profound than the nine rather jejune pages allotted to it. A similar criticism might be made of "The Diplomatic Background", while in "The Baroque Approach" an opportunity is let slip for a descriptive account of the masque from both its literary and mechanical aspects. The vast expenditure on these spectacular marvels is rightly indicted as raising a barrier between Court and citizens, but it is surely over-stating the case to say that "James I, and still more his son, paid for that magnanimity with the nation".

Dr. Mathew's account of Arundel, Conway and Coke is wholly satisfying. He is overkind, or perhaps fairer than most, in acquitting Conway of sycophancy towards Buckingham, but his estimate of Arundel's lofty indifference to religion and his unoriginal receptivity in the matter of artistic taste cannot be gainsaid.

The accuracy of the author's judgement, as well as his acknowledged felicity of phrase, is again to the fore when he describes the Catholic minority as "a widespread, loosely organized and gradually receding community and not a leaven". It might still be termed a corporate body, but unfortunately its wealthiest members were too often accessible to Court influence. "It was the summit of the iceberg of English Catholicism that was constantly melting away."

In this unusual survey of the Jacobean Age, Dr. Mathew presupposes in his readers a fairly full knowledge of the period, yet his wide reading of family papers, contemporary diaries, memoirs and other literary sources enables him to throw fresh sidelights on the period, reflecting it at new and original angles. For that alone the book is worth buying. The author's acute, unhurried judgement and his happy knack of hitting off an attitude or summing up a character in an all-too-quotable phrase give the book an added value. This review was begun with the knowledge that the author

of *The Jacobean Age* had just become bishop-elect ; by the time it appears Bishop Mathew will have a two-fold cause for congratulation. It is devoutly to be hoped that his new duties will not retard the publishing of the volume on the Early Carolines with which he intends to continue his survey of the seventeenth century.

GORDON ALBION.

Faith and Commonsense. By the Very Rev. Canon J. P. Arendzen, D.D., Ph.D. Pp. xi + 266. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 6s.)

A Layman's Christian Year. By Ernest Oldmeadow. Pp. xii + 290. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 7s. 6d.)

OWING to its pervading air of mystery and because of its far-reaching historical background, the cycle of the Liturgy presents a study that is inexhaustible. Preachers find in it a great treasure-house of themes for sermons ; writers of devotional works are familiar with its every phase ; all prayer-books are in some way modelled upon it. In a word, it is the soul of Catholic life. Neither Canon Arendzen nor Mr. Oldmeadow has produced a strictly liturgical work, but each of them travels round the orbit of the Church's year and writes his record of a most interesting journey.

Canon Arendzen is here essentially the preacher. A sentence from the Gospel of the day, or a phrase from the Lesson, is sufficient to enable him to point out how the doctrines of Christianity apply at the present moment, as they have applied to every generation since the time of Our Lord. Occasionally we are given a sermon for a particular feast-day, but usually the author deals with the problems and difficulties of life, showing how they may be met and overcome with the aid of faith. One is tempted to quote at length from these chapters in illustration of how varied is the material from which they are woven. Let it suffice to say that they find the author equally at home when discoursing on the Nine Lepers as when defining the Perfect Gentleman.

Mr. Oldmeadow's quite delightful book is, as the title proclaims, for the layman—for the busy layman, whose free hours are limited. There is an opinion abroad that the Liturgy is only for the leisured, if for anyone at all except

the priest and the religious : an idea quite foreign to the spirit of the Church. As the liturgical year progresses, it brings its message to all without exception, a message rich in meaning for laity as well as for clerics and monks and nuns. Mr. Oldmeadow has felt its inspiring joy. He analyses what the various feasts and seasons have meant to him, and presents his ideas to the reader in that direct and polished prose which for so long characterized his forceful editorship of *The Tablet*.

Considered *in globo* the content of these volumes is much the same. Canon Arendzen speaks from the pulpit, while Mr. Oldmeadow expresses the thoughts of a worshipper before the altar ; and it is interesting and instructive to see how the true spirit of Catholicity has guided both minds. Priests will find these two works of real worth when preparing their sermons.

L. T. H.

The Manual of the Children of Mary Immaculate. Translated and Adapted from the French by a Vincentian Father. Pp. 204. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 2s. 6d.)

THIS new Manual is a very useful little book which should be in the hands of every Child of Mary. It is in four parts. The first describes the history and constitution of the Association ; the second deals with the Interior Life and is brought up to date by a section on Catholic Action ; the third initiates the associate into the Liturgical Life ; and the last groups together certain appropriate devotions and prayers. The precise indications of the first part will be welcomed by Priest Directors and the other parts should prove a source of inspiration to the associates.

FROM FOREIGN REVIEWS

(1) *La Vie Commune dans le Clergé Diocésain.* (M. Picquelin in *l'Ami du Clergé*, 10 November, 1938.) Commenting on the ninth reunion at Montmartre of a considerable section of the Paris clergy, the writer sets out in this article the meaning and purpose of a movement which is widely spread in Belgium and France. The advantages gained by a closer union of the diocesan clergy, and by an even stricter depend-

ence on the Ordinary than the canon law demands, is sufficiently evident, particularly in those parts of the Church where no measure of community life exists. Canon 134, recommending the community life, has in mind the clergy of a parish living together under the same roof, aiding each other by their counsel and example; it is a method of life which is the rule in English parishes. The "community movement" goes further than this, and promotes inter-parochial communities, with a diocesan superior in charge and local superiors in authority over different sections. Fifteen dioceses, it is said, are organized on these lines in France, with beneficial results both for the faithful and for the laity. In 1934 *l'Ami du Clergé*, reviewing a book on the subject (p. 202), offered a criticism of the movement. It was to the effect that, in the past history of the Church group movements of this kind within the body of diocesan clergy have developed into religious Institutes whose characteristic has been to detach themselves from episcopal jurisdiction. No doubt any tendency of this sort is eliminated in the modern movement, for no bishop could encourage groups of his own clergy in a form of life which might eventually result in the exact opposite of its original purpose. With the rather incomplete description given in this article one receives the impression that the purposes of the movement could be obtained by the full observance of Canon 134 and especially by securing a proper functioning of Vicars Forane as effective superiors of groups of parochial clergy.

E. J. M.

(2) *Die Wochentage in ihrer liturgischen Bedeutung*. (P. Beda Danzer in *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift*, 1938, fasc. 4, p. 637.)

The writer examines ancient missals and other liturgical sources and records his findings with regard to the devotional practice of associating each day of the week with some point of Catholic doctrine or practice. *Monday* is the day of the Holy Souls, according to a Tours Missal dating from the fourteenth century, which assigns to this day a Mass from earlier Missals: "pro fratribus de hoc saeculo recedentibus". Indulged practices in the present (1938) *Preces et Pia Opera* contain one for the Holy Souls on this day, n. 547.

Tuesday, associated at first with the Angels, became devoted to St. Anne in the fourteenth century and in some parts with St. Antony. Cf. *Preces et Pia Opera*, n. 490. *Wednesday* was widely associated with St. Joseph in the later Middle Ages. Cf. *Missa Votiva*, feria iv, in our present Missal, and *Preces et Pia Opera*, n. 430. *Thursday* claimed a variety of dedications, amongst which that of the Blessed Sacrament was extremely common from the thirteenth century; it has continued, in our own days, with the well-known practice of the Holy Hour. *Friday* obviously commemorates the Cross and the Passion of Our Lord. Cf. *Preces et Pia Opera*, n. 167. More consistently and more universally than any other designation for days of the week, *Saturday* is concerned with Our Blessed Lady; many practices and interesting details are recorded by the author and there are abundant indulgenced prayers for this day. Cf. *Preces et Pia Opera*, 333, 334, 335, 362, 386. The privileged position of *B.V.M. in Sabbato* of our present Breviary has an equivalent in earlier customs dating back to the seventh century at least.

E. J. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

PAROCHIAL BENEFICES

"S" writes :

I have to thank Dr. McReavy for his statements re the powers of the faithful as providers of the *dos beneficii* in England. Will you, also, allow me to make these further remarks?

(1). Dr. McReavy appears to me to use the term "Church" in a wide sense, and, without wishing to be indicted as an opponent of the Church, I think when one knows of "canonical peculiarities" in the so-called English system as outlined by him (page 199), and when one sees a departure from the tradition of the Church, it is consistent with a Catholic mind to consider what is the teaching and tradition of the Church and at the same time to consider how the peculiar English system can be made Catholic.

(2). The "Church" in England has been guilty of many "canonical peculiarities" in the last twenty years, but it has accepted that the Ordinary and not the parish priest fixes the boundaries and site of a parish, and so far a general description of the *dos beneficii* according to its principal canon has been in various strange ways applied. There is no doubt in the Church that the *dos beneficii*, like the parish boundaries, has to be determined by the Ordinary and not by the parish priest. Could some of the responsible canonists' names be mentioned, who can be spoken of as "the Church", and who maintain that the *dos beneficii* is determined, according to the instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Consistory (vol. xv, 3, C.R. p. 191, ii), by saying "that amount in the common fund necessary for honest sustentation", etc., and the *dos cultus* is determined by saying it is in the common fund.

Wherever there is a sufficiency for honest sustentation from the offerings of the faithful, there also a *dos beneficii* can be determined. In fact, it is often easier to determine a *dos beneficii* from church collections than it is to determine one from investments, tithes, or rents.

Now since canon law treats of a *dos beneficii* as inclusive of an amount for sustentation and jurisdiction over possible

surplus, and tradition at least makes the parish priest owner of such *dos*, I respectfully ask why does the "*Church*" wish to depart from the spirit, at least, of canon law and tradition? If the Church had wished to make parish priests into mere administrators, "*superflua*" into ecclesiastical property to be treated with justice, she could have done so centuries ago.

(3). In reference to a parish priest and the system in England, Dr. McReavy writes: "I fail to see how the *Church* [italics mine] could trust him further or suspect him less, except, perhaps, by decreeing that all parochial revenue whatsoever should be his own personal property and trusting him to show a reasonable charity to the needs of his parish." I suggest that if a parish priest had the law of the Church put into effect and the endowment of the benefice determined according to tradition, then a parish priest could be trusted without suspicion to use the endowment without injustice.

(4). Finally: "The English system of undetermined offerings to a common fund may preclude the possibility of a maintenance surplus earmarked for charity, but that is all the real difference it makes." I submit that this statement is false so long as there is a real difference between the obligations of charity and justice, and so long as *the parish priest* in England has the duty of determining the principal part of the *dos beneficii* with an obligation binding him in justice, and so long as the resultant of this duty is deprivation of traditional rights. Maybe I misunderstand the meaning of "*titulus servitutis*", or what is the wish of the Church, but I am glad to agree with Dr. McReavy (p. 202) that the position in England involves something that is "evidently a matter of considerable moment to our parish priests and deserves serious reflection".

Dr. McReavy writes in reply:

"S" raises no new point of importance that I have not already dealt with, to the best of my ability, in my article, and in the subsequent correspondence; so I beg him to excuse me for not answering his long letter in detail. But I would like to assure him that I have no desire to tamper with his lawful rights. I agree with him that English parish

priests are parochial beneficiaries and have all the rights of such. They have a right, therefore, to their beneficial fruits. But since the revenue of an English parish is gathered in an undetermined mass, it is clearly necessary to have some means of knowing what is meant for them and what is meant for general parochial purposes. The Second Westminster Synod gave a ruling, and since its ruling is in substantial agreement with the law of canon 1473, I maintain that, for the time being, at least, it must be followed. The next Plenary Synod will, presumably, deal with the matter. It may agree, in effect, with the old ruling, or it may depart from it. I have no say in the matter. All I am concerned with is the present discipline.

Dr. Butterfield writes :

My attention has been drawn to an article in the September number of your REVIEW entitled "Parochial Benefices" by the Rev. Dr. McReavy.

Dr. McReavy tells us that in writing the article "his only object was to apply the rules of Canon Law, as interpreted by responsible canonists to the special circumstances obtaining here in England". Very well.

(1). Responsible canonists would tell Dr. McReavy that the Westminster Synod which is concerned with the income of missionary rectors cannot possibly have the *force of law* with regard to post-code parochial benefices. Unfortunately, the pertinent second half of Dr. McReavy's article is almost entirely based on this false assumption. Has the Synod legal force or not? Surely Dr. McReavy remembers the principle, "*Lex non nisi de materia in quam*"? It has not legal force and the conclusions based on such an error are not only useless but mischievous.

(2). Responsible canonists would therefore tell Dr. McReavy that the canonical position of English parochial benefices is determined by the code and by certain post-code diocesan legislation. The offerings of the faithful provide the *dos beneficii* and the *dos ecclesiae*. The *dos beneficii* is regulated vaguely to some extent by diocesan legislation, but possibly some of our diocesan legislation is invalid in this matter as being against the nature of benefices laid down by higher competent authority. In the last analysis

I am forced to the conclusion that there is no canonical pronouncement which exactly determines the precise proportion or relationship that should exist between the *dos beneficii* and the *dos ecclesiae*. In law the matter is left vague. And with some reason. For there are features about English benefices which militate against exact legislation. The legalist loves a law. Here there is no law but conscience. The parish priest is sufficiently restricted in handling the offerings of the faithful by considerations of justice, the needs of his parish, the obligations of his priestly calling, the intention of the donors, etc. And where conscience is ignored there is the eye of the bishop which should not be closed.

Dr. McReavy writes in reply :

It is Dr. Butterfield's contention that Decree VIII of the Second Westminster Synod, which determines the destination of the undetermined offerings of parishioners, lost all its force when our English "missions" became parochial benefices. He knows, of course, that in virtue of canon 6, particular legislation such as the aforesaid decree remains in force to the extent in which it is not contrary to the law of the Code, and that "in dubio num aliquod canonum praescriptum cum veteri iure discrepet, a veteri iure non est recedendum". If, therefore, he denies all force to the Westminster decree, it must be because he holds that it is *certainly* contrary to the Code and *to the whole of its extent*.

I reject this contention. I do not claim that the decree remains unaffected by the important change in our parochial discipline : were that my position, I would not have raised the subject. But I do most strongly maintain that the decree is still of value, at least as an interpretative guide to the application of the Code law, a key to our peculiar customs, and that, until a new Plenary Council provides otherwise, we must continue to accept this guidance as authoritative and official, to the extent in which it can be harmonized with the law of the Code.

We certainly need such guidance. The Code presumes that, in every parish, it has been made clear, either by the donors or by authority, what monies constitute the priest's beneficial fruits and what provide for the general needs of

the parish. Since the donors in England do not normally make this distinction, we have to seek a ruling from authority. The only ruling we have, at present, is the Westminster decree. It is true that this decree is concerned with "missions" rather than with benefices; but its ruling, namely, that the priest is entitled to the amount of parochial revenue necessary to his honest maintenance (including salary), is so closely in harmony with the law of the Code (c. 1473) that it must be said to remain, pending a new provision, the authoritative interpretation. "Canones quod ex parte tantum cum veteri iure congruunt, qua congruum ex iure antiquo aestimandi sunt" (c. 6, 3°).

Dr. Butterfield maintains that, for the time being, the proper apportionment of parish monies remains legally undecided, that we are enjoying an *interregnum*, and that for the past twenty years and more, "there is no law but conscience". Will any canonist seriously defend this position? In a matter of such importance, which has for centuries been regulated by law, all canonists agree that if we cannot draw a ruling from the present, we must seek a ruling from the past. But it is sufficient to quote the Code itself: "Si certa de re desit expressum praescriptum legis sive generalis sive particularis, norma sumenda est, nam agatur de poenis applicandis, a legibus latis in similibus". Surely the Westminster decree is at least a "lex lata in similibus".

ETHICS

An American correspondent asks for a list of modern works on Ethics in Latin, French or English.

Omitting the ordinary manuals of Philosophy which include Ethics, we have compiled the following list:

(a) Catholic Works:

Cathrein, *De Bonitate et Malitia Actuum Humanorum* (Musaeum Lessianum, Louvain. 1926).

Donat, *Ethica* (F. Rauch, Innsbruck. 1934).

Elter, *Compendium Philosophiae Moralis* (Gregorian University, Rome. 1934).

Lottin, *Le Droit Naturel chez St. Thomas* (Beyae, Bruges).

Jannsens, *Cours de Morale* (Institut de Philosophie, Louvain. 1926).

Gillet, *La Morale* (Desclée, Paris. 1926).

Lachance, *Le Concept de Droit selon Aristote et St. Thomas* (Sirey, Paris. 1933).

Leclercq, *Leçons de Droit Naturel* (Wesmael-Cahrlier, Namur. 1933).

Cambridge Summer School, *Moral Principles and Practice* (Sheed and Ward. 1933).

D'Arcy, *Christian Morals* (Longmans. 1937).

Vann, *Morals Makyth Man* (Longmans. 1938).

Gilson, *Moral Values and the Moral Life* (Herder. 1931).

Ward, *Values and Reality* (University of Notre Dame).

(b) Non-Catholic Works (which have been reviewed in THE CLERGY REVIEW) :

Taylor, *The Faith of a Moralist* (The Gifford Lectures. 1926-28).

Gore, *The Philosophy of the Good Life* (John Murray. 1930).

Kirk, *The Vision of God* (Bampton Lectures. Longmans. 1928).

Henson, *Christian Morality* (Gifford Lectures. 1935-36. Clarendon Press).

For the latest and most complete list the bibliography given in the Quarterly *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* (Beyaert, Bruges), should be consulted under the section headed "Theologia Moralis Fundamental" which includes philosophical works.

RELIGIOUS MINDEDNESS

CASADOS writes :—

Within the space of a fortnight this autumn I met the phrase "religious mindedness" or its equivalent, on three occasions.

First of all, in *The Times*, then in *The Catholic Herald*, and finally in an interesting article by Mr. Raybould in the October CLERGY REVIEW.

Is not "religious mindedness", in the sense of a natural attraction to God and the things of God existing in a greater degree in one man than in another, the "Mrs. 'Arris" of dogmatic theology ?

MODERN CHURCH ARCHITECTURE

Mr. J. P. Alcock writes :

In a review of "Art Notes" in your November issue Fr. J. P. Redmond deals at considerable length with my article on the architectural work of Mr. F. X. Velarde. While admiring Mr. Velarde's churches, he objects to many of my arguments in defence of "modern" church architecture. I will be grateful if you will allow me to answer his objections.

At the present time, when so many pitifully bad churches are being built, I particularly wish not to add to the misunderstanding between architects and laymen ("laymen" in the architectural sense), which is largely responsible for this state of things. From the fact that we both admire St. Matthew's and St. Gabriel's it is evident that there is more common ground between Fr. Redmond and myself than he thinks. I should be happy to increase it.

There seems to be a strange contradiction in Fr. Redmond's remarks, since he approves these churches which I approve yet disputes the reasons which I give for my approval. He says, I admit, that Mr. Velarde is at his best when he keeps to traditional lines, but he surely will not deny that Mr. Velarde's churches are what is generally termed "modern" architecture. They are certainly a type of the modern architecture that I am defending, nor are they copies or imitations of anything known to me.

Whether Fr. Redmond has succeeded in classifying them among the historical styles I do not know ; I do know that the architect who designed them has never done so. Fr. Redmond cannot have it both ways ; he must forgo either his pleasure in Velarde's work or his sweeping condemnation of "modern" churches. But perhaps he means that there are some modern churches that he likes better than others, a point of view with which I can sympathize. There are bad, indifferent and good examples of any kind of architecture, and it is as unreasonable to praise a building merely because it is "modern" as it is to condemn it merely because it is not what is called "traditional".

Much misunderstanding is caused by the misuse of this

word "tradition". It is a common error to suppose that "modern" architects despise tradition. This is untrue, and though Fr. Redmond implies that I do so, he will search my article in vain for any evidence of this. Tradition is the very stuff of architecture ; no manner of building ever comes into existence without an ancestry, and no architect who does not appreciate the basic qualities in the masterpieces of the past is likely to design well in any style. But tradition does not mean copyism, which has indeed less part in living tradition than any other manner of building whatsoever.

Fr. Redmond particularly objects to a paragraph in my article which I will quote here :

"My excuse"—for defending Modern Architecture at length—"is my belief that for the worship of God, only the best in architecture and art should suffice. The warmed-up materials of a dead style are not good enough."

He says, "This is, of course, a tissue of fallacies."

Where are the fallacies? Not in the first sentence, surely ; for, though we may disagree as to what is best, he will surely admit that only the best should suffice. Then it is the statement that the warmed-up materials of a dead style are not good enough. Well, are they? Or is it the term "dead styles" which is fallacious? I think that the "tissue of fallacies" boils down to these two words.

My answer is that the term "dead styles" is true, though it is not intended as a derogatory reference, and perhaps "past styles" would have been a happier expression and one less open to misunderstanding. In their proper historical perspective the "dead styles" are alive and beautiful ; but the technique of those styles is not part of any living tradition today, to my mind. This is a matter of opinion, and my reasons for holding it are given in the longer paragraph which Fr. Redmond was good enough to quote.

I must deny strongly that I have indulged in a sweeping condemnation of much of the most glorious architecture of our time, or that I would persuade my readers that the works of architects who have found inspiration in the great masterpieces of the past are twice dead. My remarks on tradition should make that clear. The reference to "rectangular masses of concrete and glass inspired by the commercial architecture of our time" is as much a wearisome gibe as my

unfortunate "dead styles", a term which has at least a reasonable meaning. In Victorian times commercial architecture, when not pompously classic, was Gothic with a vengeance, and, alas, many of our contemporary "Gothic" churches remind me far more strongly of a nineteenth-century insurance office than of a thirteenth-century cathedral.

As to the Swiss and German churches, which Fr. Redmond finds indistinguishable from cinemas, I can only say that he must be more unfortunate in his churches or much more fortunate in his cinemas than I am.

Towards the end of his attack on modern ecclesiastical architecture Fr. Redmond passes into regions of sentimentality where I cannot follow him with sober argument, but I must question his desire to be "away from the logic of materialism". Taking the phrase in its stricter sense, I would ask, has materialism any more claim to be called logical than other systems of philosophy? I think not. Taking it in a looser meaning as applied to the material business of building, I would say that it is as impossible to escape the logic of materialism among domes, pinnacles, spires, etc., as among the simpler forms of construction. The dramatic quality, the feeling of mystery, the suggestion of infinity—all these are spiritual qualities deriving from the creative imagination of the designer. One cannot produce them like stage properties in the form of Gothic arches, traceried windows and domes.

To judge a building by its conformity or non-conformity to a style is to kill criticism. A much more basic criterion is needed. Gilbert Scott's Liverpool Cathedral is not a noble building merely because it happens to be in some degree a "Gothic" church, and a "modern" Swiss church is not good merely because it has no obvious relation to any historic style. There are good qualities common to both, and it is the business of the critic to discover them. I, though I favour "modern" buildings, have yet a very great admiration for Scott's cathedral; there are so many noble qualities in it. Cannot some of the opponents of "modern" work try to see, at the least, the good qualities at which the "modern" architects have aimed?

I wish primarily not to score debating points, but to win

least a sympathetic sympathy for those sincere contemporary architects who think as I do. In the past the designers and craftsmen of each age have given their best, in God's praise, in their great churches. Had the doctrine of a fixed style been imposed upon *them* we would have had no Byzantine, no Romanesque, no Gothic, no Renaissance. We may not in our age achieve works that will rank in the eyes of posterity with the masterpieces of those styles, but surely we alone, of all the architects of all the ages, should not be forbidden to do our best sincerely, and commanded only to imitate the old.

ST. ELEUTHERIUS

Dr. Crowley writes :

Re the Article in December number of the CLERGY REVIEW—"St. Eleutherius and the Conversion of Britain".

It is clear that the only documentary evidence for the Lucius story is the *Liber Pontificalis*. The statements of Bede and Nennius have no value apart from that.

Is not the authority of the entry in the *Liber* considerably weakened when it can be stated that it is found only in the second recension, therefore probably not before A.D., 680 and not in the first?

St. Augustine, fresh from Rome, must have been aware of this former Papal Mission if it was true, and surely he could not have failed to produce such a "trump card" at his controversial meeting with the British Bishops. But he did not.

QUID RESPONDENDUM? LETTERS TO IGNOTUS

[Introduction.—When Ignotus was a student of theology he used sometimes to get into trouble because he used to look for extenuating circumstances in the *Casus Conscientiae* offered for solution in class. The professor would put him in his place, and quite rightly, by the remark : *Responde objective*. Still, when we are dealing with actual life, *casus conscientiae* often become very subjective indeed ; and the difficulty of the confessor, or the director, usually is to adapt the objective solution of the case to the individual

with whom he is dealing. It is a question, not only stating what is right and what is wrong, but also of dealing with one whose attitude of mind is askew. Ignotus suggests that this may be best seen in the shape of letters, in which the person concerned expresses his or her mind as well as the case in which he or she may be involved. How are such letters to be answered? It is a matter, not of mere theology only, for that is often plain enough; but also of psychology, when we are dealing with one who thinks, or wants to think, that he or she is justified in some course of action. Often enough Ignotus himself does not know the answer; he hopes that others will give him the benefit of their experience or of their intuition.]

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Editor will be glad to publish any answers, or selections from them, that are sent in.

I. From Myrtle: *educated at one of our best Catholic convents, now a typist in a large firm; aged 20. She leaves us to guess the "case", as well she might.*

DEAR REVEREND FATHER,

I am afraid that in your eyes I have done a very wicked thing. But you cannot blame George. You see, he was brought up with no religion, and knows nothing about God, and, therefore, has no code, and he thinks it right to follow the instincts of nature. He says that if there is a God, who has given us certain instincts, then we ought to follow them. But, of course, I was born a Catholic, and so must obey the Pope, and if the Pope says a thing is wrong, I suppose it is wrong for us. But if I had not been born a Catholic it would not have been wrong for me either, any more than it was for George.

Oh, dear me!

Yours sincerely, MYRTLE

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

only
deal
rugs
wh
well
re su
mor
also
nks,
turne
ow t
nefit

publi
a.

onon
rues

wick
ne w
t Go
follo
d, w
ther
ey d
e it
ld n
vas f

TILL

LL